



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.


We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





BX  
5055  
.C33













THE  
HISTORY  
OF THE  
**Church of England.**

BY J. B. S. CARWITHEN, B. D.  
OF ST. MARY HALL, OXFORD; BAMPTON LECTURER FOR 1809; AND  
VICAR OF SANDHURST, BERKS.

PART THE FIRST.

TO THE  
RESTORATION OF THE CHURCH AND MONARCHY  
IN 1660.

——— “That posterity may know we have not loosely, through silence, permitted things to pass away as in a dream, there shall be for men’s information extant thus much concerning the state of the church of God established amongst us.”—HOOKER.

VOL. II.

LONDON:  
PRINTED FOR BALDWIN AND CRADOCK.

---

1829



# CONTENTS

OF

VOL. II.

---

## CHAPTER XV.

Policy of Elizabeth.—Notification of her Succession to the different Courts of Europe.—Reply of Philip, and of the Pope.—Associates Protestants with Papists in the Privy Council.—Her Coronation.—Meeting of Parliament.—Statutes concerning Religion.—Act of Supremacy, and Court of High Commission.—Act of Uniformity.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Disputation in Westminster Abbey.—Liturgy of Edward the Sixth, with some Modifications, restored.—Appointment of Parker to the See of Canterbury, and his Consecration.—Protestant Episcopacy restored.—Treatment of the Romish Prelates . . . . . Page 1

## CHAPTER XVI.

Royal Visitation and Injunctions.—Articles of Religion agreed on by the Archbishop and Bishops till the Meeting of Parliament.—Jewel's Sermon at Saint Paul's Cross.—Conduct of the Popes Paul IV. and Pius IV.—Second Parliament of Elizabeth.—Statute of Assurance.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.—Proceedings of the Lower House with regard to Ceremonies.—Nowell's Catechism.—Jewel's Apology.—Genevan Bible.—Bishops' Bible . . . . . 35

## CHAPTER XVII.

Origin and Progress of Puritanism.—Cecil's Address to the Queen.—Many of the Clergy refuse to wear the Habits.—Case of Samson and Humfreys.—Their Correspondence with



the foreign Reformers.—Puritans take Advantage of a papal Bull to the University of Cambridge, and are licensed as Preachers.—First Separation of the Puritans from the Church.—Conduct of the See of Rome.—Rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland.—Bull of Pius the Fifth.—Increase of Puritanism.—Cartwright.—Parliament and Convocation meet.—Proceedings in both.—Jewel's Sermon at Saint Paul's Cross against the Puritans.—Death of Jewel . . . . . Page 65

### CHAPTER XVIII.

Different Sects of the Puritans.—Their Influence in the Council, and in the House of Commons.—First Admonition to Parliament by Field and Wilcox.—Second Admonition to Parliament by Cartwright.—Whitgift's Controversy with Cartwright.—First Presbyterian Congregation at Wandsworth.—Puritans attempt to join the foreign Congregations.—Prophesyings of the Clergy.—Parker's Death.—Grindal's Succession.—Refuses to suppress the Prophesyings, and is suspended.—Parliament meets, and enacts penal Statutes against Papists and Puritans.—Further Dissensions.—Death of Grindal, and Succession of Whitgift.—Revives the Discipline of the Church.—Puritans propose their Scheme of Discipline in Parliament, but it is rejected.—Speech of the Queen at the Prorogation of Parliament . . . . . 97

### CHAPTER XIX.

Application of the Puritans to the Convocation and to Whitgift, for Relief.—Dangers to the Government.—Spanish Armada.—Conduct of the Papists and Puritans.—Martin Marprelate.—Answers by Bridges and Cooper.—New Parliament.—Severe penal Laws passed.—Of the Barrowists, and the Execution of their Leaders.—Penry's Character and Death.—Writings of the English Divines against Puritanism.—HOOKER'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY . . . 131

### CHAPTER XX.

Progress of doctrinal Calvinism.—Disputes at Cambridge.—Predestinarian Controversy.—Lambeth Articles.—Schism

## CONTENTS.

v

between the Jesuits and Seculars.—Death of Elizabeth.—  
Accession of James.—State of the Scottish Church.—Whit-  
gift sends Nevil into Scotland.—Assurances of James to pro-  
tect the Church of England.—Millenary Petition.—Hamp-  
ton Court Conference . . . . . Page 167

## CHAPTER XXI.

Meeting of Parliament.—Speech of the King.—Canons of  
1604.—Succession of Bancroft to the Primacy.—Gun-  
powder Plot.—Oath of Allegiance.—Controversy on the  
Lawfulness of the Oath.—Supplement to the Catechism.—  
New Translation of the Bible.—Attempt of James to  
re-establish Episcopacy in Scotland.—Death of Bancroft.  
—Succession of Abbot . . . . . 207

## CHAPTER XXII.

Opposition of James to the Doctrines of Arminius.—His Con-  
troversy with Vorstius.—Quinquarticular Controversy.—  
Synod of Dort.—Decline of doctrinal Calvinism in the  
Church of England.—Partiality of James to the Doctrines  
of Arminius in his latter Days.—Relaxation of the penal  
Laws against the Papists.—Writings of Montague.—Death  
of James I. . . . . 235

## CHAPTER XXIII.

Accession and Marriage of Charles I.—First Parliament.—  
Petition against Popery.—Quinquarticular Controversy  
brought before the House of Commons.—Montague's Ap-  
pello Cæsarem.—The King expresses his Displeasure at the  
House of Commons, and dissolves the Parliament.—Second  
Parliament.—House of Commons appoints a Committee of  
Religion, who renew Proceedings against Montague.—Sib-  
thorpe and Mainwaring's Sermons.—Suspension of Abbot.  
—Third Parliament.—Speeches in the House of Commons  
against Popery and Arminianism.—Parliament dissolved.—  
King's Visit to Scotland and Coronation.—His Attempt to  
bring the Scottish Kirk to an Uniformity with the English  
Church.—His Return to England.—Death of Abbot.—  
Succession of Laud . . . . . 266

## CHAPTER XXIV.

Ecclesiastical Administration of Laud.—Book of Sports.—Prosecution and Punishment of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick.—Opposition of Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, to the Injunctions of Laud.—His Suspension and Imprisonment.—Attempts of Laud to aggrandize the Church.—Liturgy attempted to be introduced into Scotland.—Consequent Tumults.—Solemn League and Covenant.—Charles raises an Army to subdue the Covenanters.—Pacification of Berwick.—Scottish Parliament sanctions the Abolition of Episcopacy.—Charles resolves on a second Expedition against the Scots.—A Parliament called, and dissolved after sitting three Weeks.—Convocation prolongs itsittings.—Canons of 1640.—Subsidy granted by the Clergy for the Scottish War.—Disastrous Issue of the second Expedition.—Charles is obliged to call the Long Parliament . . . Page 296

## CHAPTER XXV.

Opening of the Long Parliament.—Opening of Convocation.—Committee of the House of Commons for the Redress of religious Grievances.—Release of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, and of Bishop Williams.—Fast appointed.—Censure of the late Acts of Convocation by the House of Commons.—Laud impeached by the Commons.—Complaints exhibited against other Prelates.—Laud sent to the Tower.—Churches defaced.—Liturgy decried.—Petitions against the Hierarchy.—Petition in its Favour.—Ecclesiastical Administration of Williams.—He moves that the Bishops be excused from Attendance on Strafford's Trial.—His Advice to the King.—Bill against Deans and Chapters.—Bill for removing Bishops from Parliament.—Protestation.—Bishops impeached.—King's Journey into Scotland.—Irish Massacre.—Remonstrance of the Commons.—King's Answer.—Impeachment of the Bishops dropped, and consequent Tumults.—Prevented from Access to the House of Lords.—Their Protestation.—Their Imprisonment and Impeachment.—Bill passed for excluding them from Parliament receives the royal Assent . . . . . 337

CHAPTER XXVI.

Preparations for Hostilities.—Parliament unites with the Scots.  
 —Parliament passes a Bill for the Abolition of Episcopacy.—  
 Commencement of Hostilities.—Oxford the Residence of the  
 Court.—Treaty at Oxford.—Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction placed  
 in the Hands of a Committee of the House of Commons.—  
 Committees for scandalous Ministers and plundered Mini-  
 sters.—Fifths allowed to the ejected Clergy.—Assembly of  
 Divines.—Solemn League and Covenant taken by the two  
 Houses, and by the Assembly of Divines.—King's Expurga-  
 tion.—Regulation of the University of Cambridge.—Power  
 of ordaining Ministers vested in the Assembly of Divines.—  
 Directory . . . . . Page 379

CHAPTER XXVII.

Trial and Execution of Laud.—Treaty of Uxbridge.—Army  
 new modelled, and abandoned by the Presbyterian Chap-  
 lains.—Ruin of the King's Cause, and Termination of the  
 first Civil War.—King surrenders his Person to the Scottish  
 Army.—The Army removes to Newcastle.—Controversy  
 between the King and Alexander Henderson on Episcopacy.  
 —Death of Henderson . . . . . 418

CHAPTER XXVIII.

Propositions of the two Parliaments offered to the King at  
 Newcastle, and rejected.—King delivered by the Scots to  
 the English Parliament, and removed to Holdenby House.  
 —Visitation of the University of Oxford.—Preachers sent to  
 prepare the Way for the Visitation.—Enmities of Chilling-  
 worth and Cheynel.—Judgment of the University of Oxford  
 against the Solemn League and Covenant, the Negative Oath,  
 and the Directory.—Visitation of Oxford, and Ejection of  
 the Royalists.—King seized by the Army, and removed to  
 Hampton Court.—Flies to the Isle of Wight.—Treaty of  
 Newport.—A self-constituted High Court of Justice sits for  
 the Trial of the King.—Conduct of the different religious  
 Classes.—The King beheaded.—ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ. 456

## CHAPTER XXIX.

State of the Church of England during the Usurpation, considered: 1. In its Internal History. 2. In its External History, as connected with the existing Government, and with the expatriated King.—Declaration of Charles at Breda.—His Return.—Restoration of the Monarchy and the Church of England . . . . Page 496

# HISTORY

OF THE

## CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

---

### CHAPTER XV.

Policy of Elizabeth.—Notification of her Succession to the different Courts of Europe.—Reply of Philip, and of the Pope.—Associates Protestants with Papists in the Privy Council.—Her Coronation.—Meeting of Parliament.—Statutes concerning Religion.—Act of Supremacy, and Court of High Commission.—Act of Uniformity.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Disputation in Westminster Abbey.—Liturgy of Edward the Sixth, with some Modifications, restored.—Appointment of Parker to the See of Canterbury, and his Consecration.—Protestant Episcopacy restored.—Treatment of the Romish Prelates.

THE reign of Elizabeth has been rightly considered as the period in which the church of England attained its complete settlement. “No man, who understands the English reformation, will derive it from Henry the Eighth; it was his son who began, and queen Elizabeth who perfected it\*.” The conduct and address with which this princess supported the protestant faith, assailed by popery and puritanism, and the constancy of her adherence to it amidst all the dangers which threatened her

A. D.  
1558.  
Elizabeth.

\* King Charles I. in reply to Alexander Henderson.

CHAP. person, her crown, and her country, entitle her to  
XV. the commendation and gratitude of posterity.

---

Yet the reign of Elizabeth was not the age of civil or religious liberty; the queen was despotic in every thing, and especially in her religious government. Still, however, her conduct was more the result of the perilous circumstances in which she was placed, than of her natural disposition, in itself sufficiently domineering. She had to contend against two kinds of tyranny, popish and puritanical, each striving for the mastery, and both seeking to control the civil power; and it was not by a timid, a conciliating, or a liberal policy, that either could be subdued. Her policy was guided by the emergency of the case, and like that of the dictator in the Roman republic, her primary maxim was, "that the realm should suffer no detriment."

Let it be also recollected, that in the reign of Elizabeth the people had acquired a considerable degree of intelligence and refinement, and were less willing to submit to arbitrary power. In this reign the voice of the people was first heard, through its natural organ, the house of commons. Originally this part of the constitution was a balance on the side of the crown, against the enormous power of the nobility; but when the feudal system was broken down, the balance of the commons was shifted, and was a counterpoise against the growing power of the monarchy. In this reign the commons were not strong enough to resist, but had sufficient boldness to remonstrate against the imperious conduct of their sovereign. These preliminary observations are necessary to form a just estimate of the policy of Elizabeth.

The intelligence of Mary's death was first publicly signified to the lords lately assembled in parliament, and was then communicated to the house of commons by Heath, archbishop of York and lord chancellor. In his speech, he observed that the loss of their late sovereign would have been far more afflictive, if they had not a successor whose right and title to the crown were indisputable. The prelates and the temporal nobility intended to proclaim Elizabeth, and only waited for the commons to join in the proclamation. The whole assembly echoed their mutual consent with loud and repeated shouts of "God save queen Elizabeth, long and happily may she reign!"

A. D.  
1558.

Elizabeth.

The parliament being dissolved by the demise of the crown, some of the nobility went into the city, where proclamation of Elizabeth was again made by the lord mayor, and was received with the same lively expressions of joy. The queen was at Hadfield when she heard the intelligence of her sister's death and of her own succession, and she lost not a moment in proceeding to London. All the bishops met her at Highgate on her entrance into the city, and, with the exception of Boner, they were received graciously. By the citizens she was welcomed with the loudest acclamations. On the next day she went to the Tower, and at her entrance fell on her knees, and offered thanks to God for the change in her condition. Once she entered the fortress of London as a prisoner, now she was its sovereign, and the sovereign of England\*.

Nov. 24.

\* Camden's Elizabeth.



---

CHAP.  
XV.

Messengers were soon despatched by her to the different courts of Europe, announcing the death of the late queen, and her consequent succession. To Philip, king of Spain, she wrote a particular and grateful acknowledgment of his generous interference when she was the object of her sister's unjust suspicion. She also directed sir Edward Karn, the English ambassador at Rome, to inform the pope of the change in the government. Sir Henry Killigrew was sent privately to form an alliance with the protestant princes of Germany, and there were accredited ambassadors sent to the courts of Denmark and Holstein\*.

Philip not only returned a public assurance of his friendship, together with his congratulations, but sent a secret proposal of marriage. He was not only desirous of retaining his title and interest in England, but was apprehensive that the British dominions might be united with those of France, by the pretensions of Mary, queen of Scotland, to the English crown. He therefore proposed to obtain a papal dispensation to legalize his marriage with the sister and successor of his former consort.

The pope, Paul the Fourth, returned an answer to the communication of Elizabeth in his accustomed tone of haughty condescension. England, he declared, was no more than a fief of the apostolic see, and Elizabeth, being illegitimate, was incapable of inheriting the crown. It was impossible for him to contradict the decisions of his predecessors, Clement the Seventh and Paul the

\* Camden's Elizabeth.

Third, with respect to her illegitimacy. He was highly offended by her assumption of the regal dignity without his consent, on which account she deserved no favour at his hands ; yet, if she would renounce her pretensions, and refer herself entirely to him, he would show to her a fatherly affection, and all the favour which was consistent with the honour of the apostolic see.

A. D.  
1559.  
Elizabeth.

To the overture of Philip, Elizabeth gave such an answer as would neither wound his feelings, nor totally extinguish his hopes. Interest and conscience alike forbade her acceptance of the proposal of marriage ; but interest prompted her to retain the personal friendship and the political alliance of the king of Spain. Her counsellors wisely suggested, that to obtain a papal dispensation for her marriage would be highly impolitic, if possible ; but that, in spite of Philip's solicitations, the court of France would probably prevail with the pope to refuse it. The French king had already urged the pope on this point, and in addition to this act of indirect hostility, had openly supported the pretensions of the queen of Scotland to the English crown. The pope would naturally join with the king of France, because Mary was strongly attached to the Romish religion.

While Elizabeth was careful to preserve the friendship of Philip, at the same time that she rejected his offer, she was regardless of the favour or displeasure of the pope. His insolent message she met by a silent but significant demonstration of resentment ; she recalled the credentials of her ambassador at the papal court, and commanded his immediate return.

CHAP.  
XV.

---

In the critical situation of her early government Elizabeth found it advisable to intermix protestants and papists in her council \*; but the tendency of her religious opinions it was needless as well as impossible to conceal. While under the power of her sister, she outwardly conformed to the religion of the Romish church; but this conformity was the effect of terror. It is not to be interpreted to the prejudice of Elizabeth's sincerity; more than the written renunciation of the pope's supremacy which Mary gave to her father, but which on her accession to power she immediately falsified. Elizabeth, unlike Mary, gave no pledge to her subjects, which she was predetermined to forfeit. Her education had inclined her to the protestant faith, and she had the same motive with her sister Mary, to strengthen her attachment to the faith in which she had been educated; it was the religion of her mother. In the daughter of Anne Boleyn, the reformers might expect to find a protector and a friend.

These early prepossessions of Elizabeth were visible in the selection of her confidential ministers; for soon after her accession, she called to her administration sir William Cecil and sir Nicholas

\* The Roman catholic part were Heath, archbishop of York, the marquis of Winchester, the earl of Arundel, the earl of Shrewsbury, the earl of Derby, the earl of Pembroke, lord Clinton, lord Howard of Effingham, sir Thomas Cheyney, sir William Petre, sir John Mason, sir Richard Sackville, and Dr. Nicholas Wotton, dean of Canterbury. The protestants were the marquis of Northampton, the earl of Bedford, sir Thomas Parr, sir Edward Rogers, sir Ambrose Cave, sir Francis Knolles, sir William Cecil, and sir Nicholas Bacon. Camden's Elizabeth, p. 18.

Bacon. To the former of these statesmen the church of England is more deeply indebted than to any other laic. The plan of its legal establishment was formed under his immediate inspection, and he laid the basis of its future polity, rendering the regal supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs compatible with the divine institution of a Christian priesthood.

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

One of the first acts of Elizabeth after her accession was, like that of Mary, an act of grace: she set at liberty all who had been imprisoned in the late reign on account of religion. Having been pleasantly told that there were some prisoners not included in this act of grace, and that they were no others than the four evangelists, whom the people earnestly wished to be set at liberty; she replied, in the same strain of pleasantry, that she would first communicate with the prisoners themselves, and see whether they desired such a release.

The principle on which she acted throughout her whole reign actuated her at its commencement, and this was a conciliation between the papists and the protestants; what she thus did from policy was in conformity with her own religious opinions. Though a determined foe of papal jurisdiction, she was attached to the ancient ritual. She thought that a too great deference had been shown to foreign reformers, in regard of discipline; and that through their suggestion divine worship had been divested of many of its decencies. If possible, she would have exploded the names of heretic and papist; but as this was scarcely to be expected, she endeavoured to mitigate personal

**CHAP. XV.** hostility where she could not reconcile difference of opinion.

**Dec. 27.** Little could Elizabeth adventure to do before the meeting of parliament; but that little she was not slow to perform. Some of those who had been imprisoned on account of religion, being now released, and others in exile being permitted to return, had already made use of the service book of king Edward, presuming on the countenance of government. This imprudent precipitance occasioned a proclamation, directed equally against the papists and the reformers; for both parties had seized the opportunity of declaring their religious sentiments from the pulpit\*. All preaching therefore was prohibited, unless by a licence under the great seal; and no other doctrine was allowed than that of reading, without any exposition, the epistles, gospels, and the ten commandments. These might be read in English, with the addition of the Lord's prayer, the litany, and the creed. The other part of the service was to be regulated by the rubric of the missals and breviaries, till the queen and parliament had deliberated, whether a reformation in the service should take place. In her own chapel, she permitted the altar to remain with its appropriate ornaments; but she forbade the elevation of the host.

Before the meeting of parliament, Heath was removed from his office of lord chancellor, and sir Nicholas Bacon was appointed to that high station; and previously to the meeting of parliament the

\* Strype's Annals, vol. i.

ceremony of the coronation was performed. On the day preceding this solemnity, she proceeded from the Tower to Westminster with great state. As she ascended her chariot, she raised her eyes to heaven, and blessed God who had preserved her to see that joyful day. She acknowledged that her deliverance proceeded only from that Divine Being to whom she ascribed the praise. No part of her behaviour was more gratifying than in a circumstance which occurred as she passed under one of the triumphal arches. A Bible was let down before her, by a female child representing Truth; with the greatest reverence, and with the most impressive demonstrations of gratitude, it was received by Elizabeth: she laid it next her heart, professing that she valued the sacred gift more than all the magnificent presents, which had been offered to her on that day.

A. D.  
1559.  
Elizabeth.  
Jan. 13.

The coronation was performed at Westminster Abbey by Oglethorp, bishop of Carlisle, according to the forms of the Romish pontifical. No other bishop could be persuaded to perform the ceremonial; for although two of the protestant prelates\* made by king Edward were still alive, yet Elizabeth preferred to be crowned by a bishop actually in office, and according to the old ritual†.

A few days after the coronation, the parliament was opened by a speech from the lord chancellor; his discourse was divided into three parts, of which the first concerned religion. In this part, which, as it related to the honour of Almighty God, was

Jan. 27.

\* Barlow and Scory.

† Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. b. vi.

CHAP.  
XV.

the queen's principal concern, he exhorted the two houses to consider its distracted state, and to enter into its discussion without heat or partiality. The queen recommended them to avoid the two extremes of idolatry and superstition on the one hand, and of profaneness and irreligion on the other. She trusted that they would pursue their examination without sophistical niceties or subtle speculations, and endeavour to adjust difficult questions, so as to bring the people to an uniformity and cordial agreement.

One of the first questions which came under the consideration of the house of commons was, whether the want of the title of supreme head of the church, which the queen had not yet assumed, was a good reason for nullifying the acts concerning religion, which had been passed in former parliaments, or which were intended to be passed in the parliament now assembled? After a long discussion, it was determined that the omission did not nullify or vitiate such enactments.

The first bill introduced into the house of lords on the subject of religion was for the restitution of the tenths and first fruits of ecclesiastical benefices to the crown. Though it was unanimously passed by the temporal peers, yet it met the dissent and protestation of all the prelates who were present; but it was easily passed by the commons, and received the royal assent\*. By this act, not only the tenths and first fruits were restored to the crown, but also the impropriated benefices which had been surrendered by queen Mary.

\* Stat. 1 Elizabeth, c. 4.

Both houses of parliament being equally solicitous to recognize the title of the queen, an act was framed, which went effectually to the completion of their object, while, at the same time, it avoided all questions of doubt and controversy. It was supposed to have been framed by Cecil, and was remarkable for its delicacy and moderation. Without exposing the errors of her father, or the harsh treatment of her sister, the act declared in general terms, that "the two houses of parliament did assuredly believe the lady Elizabeth by the laws of God and the realm to be their lawful queen\*."

A. D.  
1559.  
Elizabeth.

The parliament now began its legislative proceedings on the subject of religion, with that temper which the royal message had so powerfully recommended. Many of the penal laws passed in the late reign were repealed; and there was a general enactment that no one should be molested for exercising the religion used in the last year of king Edward. Divine service was to be performed in English: the religious houses founded by Mary were suppressed, and their revenues annexed to the crown.

The two principal statutes passed in this session, by which the national religion was reformed from popery, were the act of SUPREMACY, and the act of UNIFORMITY. The first of these statutes formed the basis of the ecclesiastical government, and the last that of public worship.

The act of supremacy was entitled "An act for restoring to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over

\* Stat. 1 Elizabeth, c. 3.



CHAP.  
XV.

the state ecclesiastical, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same\*." It was the same in effect with an act passed in the reign of Henry the Eighth†, but fell short of that statute in severity. By this act, all jurisdictions and ecclesiastical privileges which had been heretofore used by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power were for ever united and annexed to the imperial crown of the realm. All appeals to Rome were prohibited; and the subject was exonerated from all impositions and exactions heretofore paid to that court. The statute likewise prohibited all publishing or teaching, and all other acts and deeds, by which any foreign jurisdiction might be maintained.

The statute was accompanied by an oath of supremacy, which was enjoined to be taken by all ecclesiastics, on penalty of forfeiting their promotions, and of being incapacitated from holding any public office. In this oath, the title of supreme head, formerly claimed by the crown, was omitted; and the omission arose, as it is said, from a conscientious scruple, rather than from a wish to conciliate the papists. The scruple was suggested by Lever, an exiled divine of eminence, and a favoured disciple of Calvin‡.

But the act of supremacy must not be dismissed without observing that it empowered the queen to erect a court as unconstitutional in its formation as it was arbitrary and oppressive in its conduct; for on a clause in this act was founded the HIGH

\* Stat. 1 Elizabeth, c. 1.

† Stat. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19.

‡ Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. iii. b. vi. Appendix, No. 48.

COMMISSION COURT for the exercise of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The commissioners might be either churchmen or laymen, they were to be appointed by letters patent under the great seal, and their powers were of the most comprehensive nature, and extended to all kinds of enormities, from heresy to a contempt of court. Their authority with respect to heresy was restrained by a provision, that nothing was to be deemed heresy which had not been already adjudged heretical by the express and plain words of canonical Scripture, or by either of the four first general councils; or which should be hereafter adjudged heretical by the high court of parliament with the consent of the clergy in convocation.

A. D.  
1559.  
Elizabeth.

The commissioners being thus appointed could exercise with greater injury, and with greater impunity, those powers which had been granted by Henry the Eighth to a single individual: their authority was irresponsible because collective. A man was liable to be condemned by this court for an opinion which he did not think heretical, till the ecclesiastical judge had so interpreted the words of canonical Scripture. The court soon entangled itself in the inextricable mazes of the canon law, and like that extended its jurisdiction over matters of a secular nature. It was a court not only without appeal, but a prohibition from the temporal courts, though of force against other ecclesiastical judicatories, was seldom allowed by the commissioners.

When the act of supremacy was brought into the house of lords, it experienced the unanimous opposition of the bishops. Heath argued that the supremacy implied a spiritual jurisdiction, and to

CHAP.  
XV.

grant such a power to a temporal sovereign was not only a dangerous novelty but a contradiction. If spiritual supremacy belonged to the kingly office, then it must follow that Herod was supreme head of the Christian church at Jerusalem, and Nero of that at Rome. Scott, bishop of Chester, spoke on the same side, but with less force than Heath.

To have established the regal supremacy would have been an imperfect measure unless it had been strengthened by another, the act of uniformity. Lest the clergy, in convocation, might enact any canons, contrary to the statutes about to be passed in parliament, the queen had issued a requisition prohibiting that body from the exercise of such a power on pain of a "præmunire." Yet Harpsfield, the prolocutor, and the lower house, made a last effort in favour of the Romish faith. Certain articles were laid before the bishops in order to be presented to parliament, and they decidedly asserted the doctrine and discipline of the church of Rome. But when they were presented to the lord keeper by Boner, no reply was vouchsafed, and all the effect which this measure of the convocation produced was that of bringing on a public disputation between the Romanists and the reformers.

A conference, by the queen's command, was appointed to take place in Westminster Abbey, before the privy council and both houses of parliament, between nine bishops and nine protestant divines\*. The disputation was limited to three

\* The nine divines on the Romish side were the bishops of Winchester, Lichfield, Chester, Carlisle, and Lincoln, with Doctors Cole, Harpsfield, Longdale, and Chidsay. The pro-

questions: 1. Whether it was not contrary to Scripture, and the custom of the ancient church, to use a tongue unknown to the people in the common prayer and sacraments? 2. Whether every church has not authority to appoint, change, and take away, ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, so the same were done to edifying? 3. Whether it could be proved by the word of God that in the mass there was a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead and living?

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

March 31.

The proposal for a conference was first made to Heath, and having been communicated by him to his brethren was accepted, though with some unwillingness. The disputation was to be carried on in writing, and the bishops, on account of their rank, were first to read their arguments. That the disputation might be managed with greater decency, the lord chancellor presided, without any authority to moderate between the parties, or to overrule any point in the controversy.

The bishops violated the preliminaries of the disputation by coming unprovided with any written arguments; but having received a reprimand from the president, Cole was nominated to deliver verbally their opinion on the first article. He was answered by Horn on the protestant side, and with such satisfaction to the whole auditory, that the Romanists would not resume the conference after the first day. The bishops of Winchester and Lincoln said that the doctrine of the catholic church was already established, and that it was an

testant divines were Scory, late bishop of Chichester, Cox, Whitehead, Grindal, Horn, Sandys, Guest, Aylmer, and Jewel.

CHAP.  
XV.

encouragement to heretics to permit it to be called in question before an unlearned multitude. They added, that the queen had incurred excommunication, a sentence which they threatened to inflict not only on herself, but also on her council. For this intemperate declaration they were sent to the Tower, and as the Romanists retired from the field of combat, the protestants were left in its undisputed possession.

The Romanists having been thus vanquished, the queen next endeavoured to secure an union among the protestants; for although the troubles of Frankfort had been appeased, and letters of reconciliation had been exchanged between the contending parties, there was the same discordancy of opinion ready to display itself in open hostility. Some were desirous of introducing the service and discipline which the English had used when at Geneva; while others were in favour of the liturgy of Edward. Some were desirous of abolishing episcopacy, and of using no rites and ceremonies which were used by the church of Rome; while others thought it expedient to withdraw no farther from the church of Rome than was necessary to preserve purity of faith, and the independence of the national church.

The last were the sentiments of the queen herself, and they influenced her in the settlement of the English liturgy. A committee of divines\* was appointed to review the second service book of king Edward the Sixth, and to adopt it as the groundwork of the new form of common prayer. It was

\* The committee consisted of Parker, Grindal, Cox, Pilkington, May, Bill, Whitehead, Sands, Guest, and sir Thomas Smith.

the chief aim of Elizabeth to unite the nation in religious worship if not in religious opinion, and she was not less solicitous to include the Romanists, if such a comprehension could be effected without a compromise of protestant principles. A great part of the nation still believed the corporal presence in a qualified or unqualified sense, and therefore the committee was recommended to expunge from the liturgy any express definition in its condemnation. In consequence, a rubric in the service book of Edward was omitted, explaining that the act of kneeling at the communion was not intended as an adoration of Christ's natural flesh and blood. In the first liturgy of Edward, the words used by the priest, on the delivery of the elements, were consistent with a belief in the corporal presence, though not necessarily implying it: in the second liturgy a form of words was substituted, incompatible with such a belief, though not offensively condemning it. But in the liturgy of Elizabeth both forms were, with great felicity, united. The committee of divines had left it at liberty whether the posture of kneeling or standing should be used at receiving the communion, but the parliament restrained it to kneeling. In the litany, among other deprecations, was one "from the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities;" but this passage, introduced by the reformers of Edward, was justly thought inconsistent with the charitable spirit which should ever accompany prayer. However strongly error may be impugned in articles and canons, in our addresses to heaven it should ever be remembered that we are all fallible, as well as sinful.

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

CHAP.  
XV.

Besides these alterations, there were other deviations from the second service book of king Edward. The rubric, directing the order for morning and evening service, was altered, and it was to be performed in the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel, with the additional direction that the chancels were to remain as in time past. The habits enjoined by the first book of king Edward, and prohibited by the second, were restored, and were commanded to be retained until some "other order should take place herein, by the authority of the queen's majesty, with the advice of the commissioners authorized under the great seal of England for causes ecclesiastical." Different interpretations were drawn from this clause, but the true interpretation was found to be that the present regulation was not intended to be temporary but permanent, and that no other order was ever intended to be taken.

The additions to the liturgy consisted principally of prayers for the queen and clergy in the daily service of morning and evening. These prayers were taken from the sacramentary of Saint Gregory, but were inserted now in the English liturgy for the first time. A selection of lessons was also made for the Sundays and holy days throughout the year.

The liturgy having been duly prepared, the bill authorizing its use was first brought into the house of commons, where it passed without debate; but in the house of lords it was encountered by the decided hostility of all the prelates, because the episcopacy was decidedly popish. The principal speakers were Heath, archbishop of York; Scot,

bishop of Chester; both of whom had opposed the act of supremacy; together with Fecknam, abbot of Westminster, who still retained his seat in the house of lords. Heath's speech has been characterized as "rather elegant than learned\*." Having enlarged on the several changes which had been made in the reign of king Edward, he asserted that both Cranmer and Ridley had often altered their opinions on the corporal presence. He argued that an act of such importance ought not to pass until it had received the assent of the clergy in convocation. "Not only the orthodox," he observed, "but even the Arian emperors commanded that points of faith should be settled and examined in ecclesiastical councils; and Gallio, by the light of nature, knew that a civil judge ought not to meddle in matters of religion†." The bishop of Chester said that the bill was contrary to faith and charity; that arguments once settled were not again to be brought in question, and that acts of parliament were improper rules of religious belief. Fecknam laid down three rules by which religion ought to be judged, its antiquity, its consistency, and its influence on the civil government. In the words of Saint Augustin, he recommended adherence to the catholic church, and he insinuated that the consent of the whole church in all ages ought to weigh more than the crude notions of a few preachers who had distracted both Germany and England.

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

The speeches of the temporal peers on the other side of the question have not been preserved; but

May 8.

\* Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. ii. b. 3.

† Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 73, folio, and Appendix to vol. i. No. 6.



CHAP.  
XV.

it cannot be supposed that the numerical superiority of the protestants in the division was obtained without some arguments adduced in their favour. The act of uniformity finally passed with the dissent of nine prelates and nine temporal lords\*.

When the session of parliament had closed, the oath of supremacy was tendered to all the bishops, and it was refused by all, with the exception of Kitchen, bishop of Llandaff, whom Camden calls "the calamity of his see." On their refusal, they were all committed to prison; but, with the exception of Boner, White, and Watson, were soon restored to liberty. These three prelates had been the principal instruments of Mary's cruelties, and imprisonment was thought only a gentle punishment. A few inferior dignitaries, joining with the bishops in their refusal to take the oath, were also deprived; but of the inferior clergy not more than eighty incurred the penalty of disobedience to the statute†.

Since the death of cardinal Pole, the see of Canterbury had remained vacant, and this circumstance, joined with the non-compliance of so many prelates, rendered the succession of a protestant episcopacy

\* The prelates were, the archbishop of York, and the bishops of London, Ely, Worcester, Llandaff, Lichfield, Exeter, Chester, and Carlisle: the temporal peers were, the marquis of Winchester, the earl of Shrewsbury, viscount Montague, and the barons Morly, Stafford, Dudley, Wharton, Rich, and North.—Collier's Eccles. History, v. ii. b. 6.

† According to Burnet: Camden and cardinal Allen compute the whole number of the deprived clergy, including bishops, dignitaries, and parochial ministers, at two hundred and forty-three.—See Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. iv.

the object of Elizabeth's solicitude. There were only three of king Edward's bishops alive, Scory, Barlow, and Coverdale, besides Hodgskins, suffragan bishop of Bedford; but a strong expectation was entertained that Heath, Thirlby, and Tonstal, would again conform to an establishment far more consonant with their opinions than that to which they had conformed in the reign of king Edward.

A. D.  
1559.  
Elizabeth.

Elizabeth had long fixed on a divine, whose qualities she well knew and approved, to preside over the protestant church of England. Matthew Parker in his early life had filled the office of chaplain to Anne Boleyn, and a short time before the death of that unfortunate princess, she had imposed on him the solemn duty of superintending the education of her infant daughter, and of instructing her in the rudiments of Christianity. This sacred trust was not neglected by Parker, and its conscientious fulfilment was always acknowledged with gratitude by Elizabeth. Her early instructor had not been undistinguished by Henry or Edward; and at the accession of Mary, he held the mastership of Corpus Christi college, in the university of Cambridge, a prebend in the cathedral of Ely, and the deanery of Lincoln. But when Mary ascended the throne, he was deprived of all his preferments; and two strong reasons contributed to his deprivation: he was a decided protestant, and he was married. Thus reduced from an honourable independence to penury, he retired into obscurity, hoping at least to find safety: he did not, like many of his brethren, retire into exile; but, without sacrificing his opinions, nobly resolved to await persecution in his

CHAP.  
XV.

own country. He was frequently exposed to the most imminent dangers, and obliged to change his abode; but his behaviour under his sufferings he has himself related, and the following edifying reflections are worthy to be transcribed. "After my deprivation, I lived so joyful before God in my conscience, and so neither ashamed nor dejected, that the most sweet leisure for study to which the good providence of God recalled me created much greater and more solid pleasure than my former dangerous and busy kind of living pleased me. What will hereafter happen to me, I know not; but to God who takes care for all, and who will one day reveal the hidden things of men's hearts, I commend myself wholly, and my godly and most chaste wife, and my dear little ones\*."

When his early pupil became his sovereign, it was not likely that his merits and his misfortunes should be forgotten: he reasonably expected to be restored to competence and peace; but more than these he wished not. An employment of the annual value of twenty nobles was desired in preference of any high dignity, and he courted a situation in the university of Cambridge, where he had spent his youth in useful activity, and where he hoped to pass his declining years in quietness. General expectation, however, was soon turned towards him as one who would not be permitted to "rest long in his cell†." Bacon and Cecil intimately knew his worth, and concurred in pro-

\* Strype's *Life of Parker*, b. i. c. 7.

† Sandys's *Letter to Parker*, in *Burnet's History of the Reformation*, vol. ii. b. 3. Appendix, No. 8.

moting the intentions of the queen, and, what was more difficult, in conquering the reluctance of Parker to accept her proffered patronage.

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

The unwillingness of Parker to emerge from his literary retirement and to engage in an active life was unfeigned; and when he knew that he was designated for the highest ecclesiastical station, he wrote to the lord chancellor, setting forth in the strongest language his inability to discharge so arduous an office in times so dangerous. Fully was he aware of the requisites for the station, and that it was necessary to fill the see with a man who was neither arrogant, timid, nor covetous. An arrogant man would, perhaps, divide from his brethren in doctrine, whereas the whole strength and safety of the church lay in unity; a timid man would raise the spirits of its enemies, and increase the jealousies within itself; and a covetous man was "profitable in no state of the community to serve it rightly." As for himself, he knew the unfitness both of his body and mind so well, that though he was unwilling to offend his partial friends, and especially the queen; yet he must still more avoid the indignation of God, and not enter on a station which he could not fulfil, so as to answer either to God or the world for his administration. He knew of what he was capable; he was poor, and unable to meet the expenses of such a dignity; he was infirm, and therefore was unfit for so active an employment. He had a very few years of life in prospect, and he had no wish to accumulate a large fortune for his family. Besides these objections, he saw that great divisions were likely to happen among the protestants, which would be a cause of

CHAP. exultation to the church of Rome: he saw that  
XV. some men were men still, even after all their teaching in the school of affliction\*.

This representation from Parker only tended to confirm the queen in her resolution, and his friends in their judgment. Bacon replied, that if he knew any man with whom the character described in Parker's letter agreed better than with its author, he would choose that man; but not knowing such, he must abide by his first choice. Parker, wearied by an importunity which proceeded so far as to threaten him with imprisonment, at last yielded; and writing to the queen herself, protested that extreme necessity had forced him to trouble her, both out of conscience to God, and regard to her service. He knew his great unworthiness for so high a function; in an inferior office he would cheerfully discharge his duty, and if he could be placed in a situation suitable to his infirmities. But in the conclusion, he submitted himself entirely to her pleasure, rather than that the loyalty and sincerity of his heart should be suspected, even by a just allegation of his own unworthiness†.

The legal forms for the appointment of Parker were expedited, but the consecration was delayed for several months. A serious difficulty opposed the speedy performance of that solemn ceremony. Many of the bishops who had refused the oath of supremacy still kept possession of their sees, and

\* Parker's letter to sir N. Bacon, in Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. iii. b. 3. Appendix, No. 8.

† Parker's letter to queen Elizabeth, in Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. ii. b. iii. Appendix, No. 8.

the queen still expected that at least three of these prelates would be induced to comply with the law.

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

A commission for the consecration of the new archbishop was directed to the bishops of Durham, Bath and Wells, Peterborough, and Llandaff, together with Barlow and Scory, who were styled in the commission bishops, though not in the actual possession of any sees. The three bishops first named in the commission having refused to proceed to the consecration, a new commission passed under the great seal, directed to Kitchen, bishop of Llandaff; Barlow, bishop elect of Chichester; Scory, bishop elect of Hereford; Coverdale, late bishop of Exeter; Hodgskins, bishop suffragan of Bedford; John, suffragan of Thetford; and Bale, bishop of Ossory, authorizing all, or any four of them, to consecrate Parker archbishop of Canterbury. The bishop of Llandaff, though he had taken the oath of supremacy, declined to assist in the consecration, probably by the instigation of Boner; but four of the bishops named in the commission, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgskins, consented. They met at the church of St. Mary-le-Bow, in Cheapside, where, according to custom, the election of the dean and chapter of Canterbury was confirmed.

All the preliminaries having been performed according to law, Parker was consecrated by the four bishops in the chapel of Lambeth. The ceremonial was that prescribed by the ordinal of king Edward, which, together with the rest of the liturgy, had been restored by the late act of uniformity. Dec. 17.

The consecration of Parker is an event which

CHAP.  
XV.

demands something more than a minute and accurate statement of its circumstances; it cannot be dismissed without some reflections. Its validity has been impugned from a design of invalidating the episcopal succession of the church of England. The Romanists have objected, that our priesthood has no divine authority, and is therefore incapable of performing the administration of divine offices with effect. They pretend that our holy orders have not been derived as they ought to have been, and as those in the church of Rome are, by an uninterrupted succession from the apostles, from Christ himself; and that the apostolical succession, so essential to a Christian ministry, was broken in the English church at the consecration of Parker. This consecration was uncanonical, because the persons engaged in it had been legally deprived by queen Mary, and had not been legally or canonically restored, and their episcopal authority was derived only from the great seal of England.

To this allegation it has been sufficiently answered, that the persons engaged in the consecration, having been once invested with the episcopal character, that character was indelible, and that their deprivation under queen Mary took place before a reconciliation was effected with the see of Rome, and by no other than a commission instituted by royal authority. The episcopal character remained in these deprived bishops, even during their exile, and they had the power of communicating it before they regained temporal possession of their sees. The episcopal power of Coverdale and Hodgskins was not less valid, because they never exercised it afterwards; nor that of Scory

and Coverdale, because they were consecrated by an ordinal different from that of the church of Rome; nor that of Hodgskins, because he was only a suffragan bishop. The assistance of Coverdale and Hodgskins, in the present consecration, was a voluntary act, and their ceasing afterwards to perform any other episcopal function was equally voluntary. The ritual of Edward the Sixth retained all which was necessary to confer the episcopal character, all which was practised in the primitive ages, and all which had been retained by the Greek church. The institution of suffragan bishops is known to the church of Rome, and their power is recognized as rightful and sufficient.

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

It has been also answered, that when a church is overrun with error, or otherwise unsettled in its constitution, it cannot be bound by those rules, to which it may rigidly adhere in a pure and settled state. When the Arian bishops were dispossessed of some of the chief sees on account of their heresy, the orthodox bishops ordained others in their room, without a strict attention to the canons usually and properly observed.

Neither has the objection of the Romanists any weight that the bishops of a province cannot, according to primitive custom and the canon law, consecrate their own superior, and invest him with an authority over themselves. Such was the course anciently adopted in the isle of Cyprus, where the suffragan bishops always consecrated their own metropolitan, and were maintained in that right by the council of Ephesus \*.

\* Bishop Ellys's Tracts on Spiritual and Temporal Liberty, p. 219.



CHAP.  
XV.

It has been also objected, not only that the consecration was uncanonical, and consequently invalid, but that it was performed in a clandestine, indecent, and even in a profane manner \*. This aspersion has been propagated by infidels, who might have known its falsehood, but it has been refuted by those whose prejudices against episcopacy might have induced them to believe it, if it had been credible. The calumny was unknown to the earliest assailants of the protestant hierarchy, and was not invented till forty years after the transaction; but as soon as it was invented, its absurdity was convincingly exposed, and its falsehood irrefragably proved. The register of the see of Canterbury, in which the consecration was recorded, is still extant, and bears all possible marks of authenticity. This register was referred to by archbishop Parker himself, for another purpose—that of confirming his own consecration, and that of his brethren, by an act of parliament, seven years after they had been elevated to their respective sees. The register was again produced by archbishop Abbot in the reign of James the First; and liberty was granted by that prelate to some Romanists to peruse and examine the document. Before that time, the fact of the consecration, according to the ritual of king Edward, was never disputed; but only the validity of the consecration, supposing

\* At the Nag's Head Tavern in Cheapside. "That this lie of a Nag's Head was bred in a knave's brains doth plainly appear; for why should a rich man be a thief? All the churches in the land were open to them." Fuller's Church History, b. ix. Mr. Hallam, in his Constitutional History, observes, that Dr. Lingard does not support the story of the Nag's Head.

it to have been performed according to that ritual. The evidence from the registers concerning this transaction was confirmed in the reign of James the First, by the testimony of the earl of Nottingham, who declared in the house of lords, that he was himself present in Lambeth chapel at the consecration of archbishop Parker\*.

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

. When the see of Canterbury had been filled, it was necessary to provide for the suffragan bishoprics, but, under existing circumstances, this was a difficult task. The attention of the queen and her ministers had been naturally directed to the exiled divines, who had undergone so many privations for the protestant faith; but many of them had returned with opinions which at once disinclined and disqualified them for any share in the government of the English church. They had adopted the principles of the foreign reformers on civil government and ecclesiastical discipline, and on some points of theological doctrine; but these principles were widely at variance with those of Elizabeth, and the great majority of the English nation. There was also, at this juncture, not only a Genevan, but a Lutheran party. There were not a few who endeavoured to settle the church, according to the confession of Augsburg; while the disciples of Calvin had been trained under a master who exacted implicit deference, and forbade them to resort to any other master for instruction.

. In the selection of Parker the queen had been singularly fortunate; for, by remaining at home,

\* Bishop Ellys's Tracts on Spiritual and Temporal Liberty, p. 223.

CHAP.  
XV.

he had been uncontaminated by foreign prejudices, and he lamented, with keen anguish, the change of opinion in his banished friends. But there was scarcely another divine of eminence placed in a similar situation. Of the five expatriated bishops, Poinet was dead, and two of the remaining four refused to reassume their episcopal functions. Bale, formerly bishop of Ossory, had been an early convert from the errors of popery, but by embracing protestantism, he did not renounce episcopacy. He accepted a see in Ireland, and was consecrated according to the ordinal of Edward; but he returned with a different spirit: he thought that he had discovered episcopacy to be an institution of the seventh century, and an invention of the monks. He therefore chose to retire on a prebend of Canterbury, and there employed the remainder of his days in composing antipapistical invectives, and sacred comedies \*. Coverdale, although he consented to assist in the consecration of Parker, yet he officiated without his episcopal habit, and ended his days in a state of separation from the church. Barlow and Scory were restored to the episcopal office, but neither of them was placed in his former bishopric; and with the exception of these, and Kitchen, bishop of Llandaff, the whole episcopacy of England was to be renewed.

Of those divines whose opinions were not changed by exile, and who returned with their former partiality for an episcopal government, Cox was the most distinguished. His resolute maintenance of

\* Brooks's Lives of the Puritans.

the English liturgy, in opposition to the personal opposition of Knox, and the written attack of Calvin, entitled him to a high place in the church of England, and his merit was not more than adequately rewarded by the bishopric of Ely. In this station his conduct corresponded with that which he had throughout his life maintained; and in the fierce disputes which arose concerning the habits and other ceremonies of the church, he appears not to have participated. He rather lamented the decay of practical religion, and the neglect of the word of God, which generally prevailed; and these evils he assiduously laboured to correct.

A. D.  
1559.  
Elizabeth.

Grindal was promoted to the important see of London: he had also distinguished himself in the troubles of Frankfort, and had been the coadjutor of Cox. No one more deeply lamented the controversies which had taken place among the reformers, and no one was better fitted, by the mildness of his temper, to reduce dissentients to conformity. He had been a diligent collector of documents relative to the sufferings of the protestant martyrs, and Fox received valuable assistance from Grindal in the compilation of his work. If friendship for his companions in exile induced him to connive at their irregularities, and even their total defection from ecclesiastical discipline, yet his lenity and forbearance, originating in such a motive, cannot but be regarded with respect.

Horn, the dean of Durham, in the reign of Edward, who had adhered to Cox during the troubles at Frankfort, and had finally seceded with him from the refractory congregation, was ap-

CHAP. pointed to the see of Winchester; Pilkington, on  
XV. the removal of Tonsal, succeeded in the bishopric of Durham; and the sees of Worcester and Rochester were conferred on Sandys and Guest.

And Jewel, "the ornament of his age for learning and piety," the glory of the reformation, was not forgotten. So high was his reputation, that immediately on his return from exile, he was selected as one of the protestant divines in the conference at Westminster-abbey. After this, he was appointed one of the commissioners for a general visitation, and was sent into the western district; and having discharged this important trust, the queen testified her approbation by his nomination to the bishopric of Salisbury.

Bishoprics were offered to other eminent divines, who refused to accept the charge; some from a dislike of the habits and ceremonies prescribed by the act of uniformity, others from a disinclination to episcopal government, and from an objection to acknowledge the regal supremacy. Among the recusants are found the names of Whitehead, Knox, and Bernard Gilpin. This last divine, often known by the title of the Apostle of the North, was a relative of Tonsal, and was sent by that prelate to "visit the foreign churches," during the reign of king Edward. While Gilpin was at Paris, Tonsal requested him to superintend the printing of a work written by himself on the doctrine of transubstantiation. This doctrine was candidly acknowledged by the bishop to be a novelty, and he expressed his free censure against Innocent the Third for declaring its belief to be essential to salvation.

When Tonsal was restored by Mary to the see of Durham, of which he had been so unjustly deprived, Gilpin returned to England, and although a zealous antipapist, rather than a decided protestant, lived during the Marian persecution, not indeed without hazard, but in the legal possession of a lucrative benefice, and in the unrestrained performance of his pastoral duties. He was indebted for his safety to the general lenity and the particular esteem of Tonsal, his relative and diocesan; and he was more than protected by this truly catholic prelate—he was preferred; and in that situation in which he had been placed by his patron, he chose to pass the remainder of his life\*.

A. D.  
1560.  
Elizabeth.

Curiosity will be naturally directed to the condition of those prelates, who were deprived for their refusal to acknowledge the regal supremacy, or to conform to the church, as it was established under Elizabeth. As the name of Bernard Gilpin is so intimately associated with that of Tonsal, it should first be noticed, that both Tonsal and Thirlby were received under the hospitable roof of the primate, where they lived with freedom and comfort. Heath was solicited by every mode of application to continue in the archbishopric of York, and the see was kept vacant for two years, in the hope of his conformity; but his pertinacious refusal caused no abatement in the esteem of the queen; he lived and died quietly in his own house in Surrey†, and was often honoured by a visit from his sovereign.

The sanguinary Boner, respected by no party, because he had betrayed all, dragged on many

\* Bishop Carleton's Life of Bernard Gilpin.

† At Cobham.

CHAP.  
XV.

years in obscurity, and was confined, though without any severe restraints, in the Marshalsea, and at last died with general execration \*. White and Watson, his companions, but not his equals in cruelty, were at first imprisoned, but were soon restored to liberty, and assigned competent pensions. Brookes, bishop of Gloucester, died soon after the accession of Elizabeth.

Of the remaining prelates three quitted the kingdom, and the rest were consigned, either to the custody of their friends, or of some protestant bishop. The abbey of Westminster was again converted into a deanery and college; and Fecknam, its late abbot, "a charitable and generous man, lived in a private station with universal esteem †." The religious houses being dissolved, most of the monks returned to a secular life; but the nuns withdrew themselves into foreign countries.

\* He died Sept. 5, 1567. Godwin de presulibus.

† Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. ii. b. 3.

## CHAPTER XVI.

Royal Visitation and Injunctions.—Articles of Religion agreed on by the Archbishop and Bishops till the Meeting of Parliament.—Jewel's Sermon at Saint Paul's Cross.—Conduct of the Popes Paul IV. and Pius IV.—Second Parliament of Elizabeth.—Statute of Assurance.—Proceedings in Convocation.—Thirty-nine Articles of Religion.—Proceedings of the Lower House with regard to Ceremonies.—Nowell's Catechism.—Jewel's Apology.—Genevan Bible.—Bishops' Bible.

THE act of supremacy having empowered the queen to establish the court of high commission, it was soon organized, and a royal visitation was instituted throughout England. To direct the inquiries of the commissioners, a body of injunctions was prepared, having some points of resemblance, but many more of difference, to the injunctions of king Edward.

In the celebration of divine worship it was ordered that the science of church music should be preserved, and that all lands settled for the maintenance of choirs should be appropriated to that purpose. A caution was given, that an affectation of skill in singing should not be carried so far as to make the use of the church service less significant; but that the common prayer should be sung or chanted so distinctly that the words might not be lost. For the satisfaction of those who had a predilection for sacred music, an anthem was

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.  
June 24.



CHAP. allowed at the beginning or end of the service\*.  
XVI.

In pursuance of this injunction, the psalms were sung in a plain manner in most parish churches; but in cathedrals, and in the royal chapel, the choral service with its accompaniment of an organ was uniformly practised, and the cultivation of sacred music was encouraged.

The customary marks of reverence, during the performance of divine service, were still to be observed. In the time of reading the litany, and other collects, all the people were commanded to kneel; and when the name of Jesus was at any time pronounced, all persons were to bow the head, or show some suitable mark of reverence. One of the injunctions directed that no altar should be taken down, but under the inspection of the minister and churchwardens; and at the end of the injunctions, an order was given to the same effect, with a clause subjoined, that, except on account of uniformity, it seemed to be a matter of no moment whether altars or tables were used, so that the sacrament were duly and reverently administered.

There was another article deserving of notice, as not being strictly of a religious nature, that which imposed a restraint on the liberty of the press. No book or pamphlet was permitted to be printed or published without a licence from the queen, or six of her privy council, or her ecclesiastical commissioners, or the archbishops of Canterbury and York, the bishop of London, the chancellors of both universities, the bishop of the diocess being ordinary, and the archdeacon of the place where

\* Article 49.

any such book was printed. But from the operation of this rule all ancient and profane authors were excepted.

A. D.  
1559.

Elizabeth.

An explanation was also given concerning the oath of supremacy which had been misconstrued by some, as if the kings or queens of England had claimed an authority or power to administer divine service in the church. In this sense, the supremacy was disclaimed; and no other ecclesiastical power was challenged, than such as had been exercised by Henry the Eighth, and Edward the Sixth, "and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of the realm." This power was, "under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons" within the realm of England, "both ecclesiastical and temporal, so as no foreign power might have any superiority over them."

The review of the common prayer, the omission of the deprecation against the pope in the litany, the re-establishment of some part of king Edward's first service book, the decency of the sacerdotal habits, and the solemnity with which divine service was by the injunctions commanded to be performed, reconciled a great part of the laity of the Romish church. It is a fact beyond reasonable doubt, that, for the first ten years of the reign of Elizabeth, the principal persons of the Romish communion resorted ordinarily to church without scruple or dissatisfaction\*.

The more violent part of the Romanists, as it

\* The authorities to prove this fact are too numerous for reference; one therefore is sufficient, and that is the strongest. The fact was averred by the queen, in her instructions to sir Francis Walsingham, dated August 11, 1570.

CHAP.  
XVI.

might be expected, aimed at a recognition of the papal supremacy; and the deprivation of the Romish bishops occasioned remonstrances from foreign princes. The queen was solicited to grant more than a toleration; to allow a partial establishment of popery, and to grant some churches in large cities to her subjects of that persuasion. But her answer was decisive;—that the deprived bishops had disobeyed the laws, and disturbed the peace of the kingdom; that some of them had refused compliance with that doctrine to which they had themselves conformed in the reign of her father and brother; and that to grant them churches, for the purpose of keeping up a distinct communion, was contrary to the public interest and her own conscience\*.

Dec. 4. Not only foreign interference was employed, but the deprived bishops addressed a remonstrance to the queen, exhorting her to return to the old communion. They reminded her that Christianity was planted in England by the church of Rome, and implored her to recollect the acknowledged supremacy of its bishop. The address, containing some reflections on the conduct of her father and brother, Elizabeth retorted on the subscribing prelates† with severe personality, and denied the fact that Christianity was originally propagated in England by missionaries from Rome.

Though the act of supremacy had conferred on the queen an absolute power in the church; and though the act of uniformity had shown that par-

\* Camden's Elizabeth, p. 41.

† The address was subscribed by Heath, Boner, Bourn, Turberville, and Pool.

liament exercised a right of prescribing the form of national worship; yet a confession of faith was not deemed to be within the province of either royal or parliamentary authority. This was thought to belong peculiarly to the two houses of convocation, and therefore until that body should reassemble, a short profession of doctrine was agreed on by the archbishop and bishops. All incumbents, before admission to any benefice, were obliged to signify their assent to it, and after admission, to read it twice in every year in their churches, for the instruction of the people\*.

A. D.  
1560.

Elizabeth.

The articles were ten in number, and contained :

1. An acknowledgment of the Trinity; 2. a profession of belief in the canonical Scriptures, and of the three creeds; 3. a definition of the nature and authority of the church; 4. a declaration of the authority of the ministerial office; 5. an acknowledgment of the regal supremacy; 6. a renunciation of the papal jurisdiction; 7. a declaration that the book of common prayer is agreeable to the Scriptures; 8. an admission that the disuse of oil and other superstitious ceremonies in baptism does not take away the validity of that sacrament; 9. a rejection of private masses, and of the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice in the mass; 10. an assent to the practice of administering the communion in both kinds. To these ten articles, another was added, disallowing the extolling of images, relics, and feigned miracles, and all modes of expressing the invisible God in a bodily form; all pilgrimages, praying upon beads, and similar superstitions. This

\* Burnet's Hist. of the Reformation, vol. ii. b. 3. Appendix, No. 11.

**CHAP.  
XVI.**

---

last article was in the form of a declaration by the assenting ecclesiastic, and contained an acknowledgment that such assent was given without compulsion, with freedom of mind and conscience, and on a sure persuasion that the articles were true, and agreeable to the word of God.

This declaration of faith is a demonstration that the reformers under Elizabeth, while they conducted their opposition to the church of Rome with prudence and temper, never sacrificed any protestant principle, nor abandoned any protestant doctrine. They never conceded that the points of difference between the churches of England and Rome were unimportant; and on the other hand, they never maintained that it was impossible to recede too far from the doctrines and worship of the Romish church. Because the pretended supremacy of the pope was unscriptural, they did not draw the absurd conclusion that episcopacy was one of the corruptions of popery; because superstitions and errors had found their way into the missal, they did not infer that a liturgy was unlawful. They concluded that they were bound to reform all which was contrary to the common and avowed standard of appeal, the word of God, but to reform nothing more.

That no compromise was intended with the church of Rome is evident, if proof were wanted, from the conduct of the most influential prelate in the English church, bishop Jewel. At this crisis he delivered his celebrated sermon at Saint Paul's cross, in which twenty-seven points of doctrine, maintained by the church of Rome, were distinctly enumerated, and, at the end of each, a challenge

was given by the preacher to any antagonist who would defend its truth. The challenge was conveyed in these memorable words: "If any learned man of our adversaries, or all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor or father, or general council, or holy scripture, or any one example in the primitive church, whereby it may be clearly proved, during the first six hundred years, then I shall be content to yield and subscribe." The twenty-seven articles related to those two fundamental errors, formerly marked out by Ridley as the source of all others; the primacy of the bishop of Rome, and the sacrifice of the mass. Two only of the articles cannot be comprised under these heads, that on the celebration of divine worship in an unknown tongue, and that which asserts ignorance to be the mother of devotion.

A. D.  
1560.

Elizabeth.

The challenge of Jewel having been thus proclaimed before so large an auditory, startled the English papists, both at home and abroad, and among the last, such of the English fugitives as had retired to Louvain, Douay, or Saint Omer. "The controversy occasioned by it was first discussed in a series of friendly letters between Jewel and Cole, the late dean of Saint Paul's; then more violently agitated in a book by Rastal, who first appeared in the lists against the challenger; followed herein by Dorman and Marshal, who were successively vanquished by Nowell and Calphill; but these were only skirmishes preparatory to the main encounter between the challenger himself and John Harding, one of the divines of the Louvain, and the most learned of that college. The

CHAP.  
XVI.

combatants were born in the same county\*, educated in the same school†, and had studied at the same university‡. Both were zealous protestants in the time of king Edward, and both relapsed into popery in the time of queen Mary; Jewel through fear of death, and Harding on hope of preferment; but the fall of Jewel may be compared to that of Saint Peter, short, sudden, and rising greater from his fall; while that of Harding was like that of Judas, premeditated and irrecoverable. Which of the combatants had the advantage in this contest will easily appear to any one who consults their writings. The learned answers of Jewel contain such a magazine of all sorts of learning, that future writers have thence furnished themselves with arguments and authority§."

The pope was constantly advertised of the progress of the English reformation, and when he too late perceived that his extravagant pretensions to dispose of the crown were treated with scorn, he became more moderate in his demands; he only insisted that there should be no change in religion. But when he found that his interference in the settlement of the church was rejected, he joined in the intrigues of the French court, and strenuously supported the title of the queen of Scotland to the sovereignty of England.

1559.  
August.

But the death of the pontiff changed the policy of the court of Rome. Pius the Fourth, of the Medicean family, possessed a large share of its dexterity in negotiation, and of its flexibility of conduct to circumstances. He wisely considered

\* Devonshire. † Barnstaple. ‡ Oxford.

§ Heylin's Eccles. Restaur. p. 301.

that to use threats, without any power of putting them into execution, was a mark always of folly, and often of cowardice. He knew that the imperious demands of his predecessor had stimulated Elizabeth to proceed with more vigour in the reformation, and he resolved to try whether she might not be gained by some concessions and many specious professions of friendship. For this end, he despatched Parpalia to England with a letter to the queen, and instructions for his conduct; the letter is well known, the instructions are matter of conjecture. The epistle began with the customary apostolical benediction, and with solemn protestations of affectionate concern for the queen; how great that concern was would be fully explained by his nuncio. He exhorted her to dismiss her evil advisers from her councils, and to resign herself to the admonitions of himself, her spiritual father. She might then assure herself of receiving from him any compliance consistent with the dignity of his station, not only with reference to her spiritual advantage, but to the service and security of her royal dignity\*. What might be the nature of Parpalia's instructions is not certain; but common report at this time affirmed, that the pope had engaged to sanction the English liturgy; to permit that the holy communion might be administered to the laity in both kinds; and to reverse the sentence which had passed in the consistory against the validity of her mother's marriage; and that these concessions were offered on condition that the queen would return to the

A. D.  
1568.

Elizabeth.

May 5.

\* Camden's Elizabeth.



CHAP.  
XVI.

Romish communion, and acknowledge the primacy of the pope\*.

But this application had no effect on Elizabeth and her counsellors; she was advised by Cecil not to rest her title to the crown on her descent, but on the testament of her father, ratified by the authority of parliament. For her security against the pretensions of the queen of Scotland, she relied more on the treaty at Edinburgh, concluded by her own ambassadors, than on any bull of the Vatican. When this treaty was violated by the Scottish queen, supported by the court of France, the pope once more attempted to gain the queen of England. He despatched Martinengo to England, inviting her to participate in the council of Trent, and assuring her that either her ambassadors or her bishops should experience a most honourable reception.

Whatever dangers menaced the security of her government, either from foreign hostilities, or from domestic rebellion, Elizabeth firmly refused to govern her kingdom by the aid of the pope. Instead of acceding to the invitation, the council, after a long deliberation, resolved that the papal nuncio should not be permitted to land on the English shore. To receive a person under this character implied an acknowledgment of the papal supremacy, and it was forcibly argued that the popes always turned the slightest concessions to their advantage. It was therefore most prudent to refuse all intercourse with the see of Rome, and to keep at the most remote distance. The report

\* Heylin's History of the Reformation.

that a nuncio was coming into England had emboldened the papists not only to break the laws, but to spread a report that the queen was about to change her religion. In Ireland the pope's legate had abetted the rebellion, and pronounced against the queen's title to the crown, and there was no security against the same conduct in England\*.

A. D.  
1561.

Elizabeth.

The second parliament of Elizabeth was intended to confirm and complete the ecclesiastical polity of England; and the convocation was designed to model those parts which were foreign to parliamentary cognizance. The parliament enacted a statute for the assurance of the queen's regal power over all estates and subjects within her dominions. It was an extension of the act of supremacy, and was pointed against those who maintained the "jurisdiction of the see of Rome unjustly claimed and usurped within the realm." The oath of supremacy was to be taken not only by all ecclesiastics, but by the house of commons, by all common lawyers and all schoolmasters. To write, preach, print, teach, or in any other manner to maintain the authority of the pope within the kingdom of England, subjected the offender to the penalties of a "præmunire" for the first offence, and of high treason for the second.

1562.  
Jan. 12.

The bill was strongly opposed in the house of lords by viscount Montague, and in the house of commons by Atkinson. The arguments of the latter were not without effect, and those of Montague procured the insertion of a clause, releasing

\* Heylin's History of the Reformation.

CHAP.  
XVI.

every peer from taking the oath \*. The archbishop of Canterbury also, by the queen's order, enjoined the bishops not to tender the oath unless in a case of necessity, and never to press it a second time without his special direction. But he desired that these suggestions might not be interpreted as if he were a favourer of obstinate recusants. "My design," he said, "is only to recommend the governing our flocks with a pastoral care, it being part of our character not to be swayed by resentment and private regards, but to proceed by gentle motions, and endeavour to gain the misled by methods of lenity †."

Jan. 13.

The convocation in which the articles of the church of England and the standard of doctrine were finally settled, was opened at Saint Paul's on the day following the meeting of parliament. Day, the provost of Eton, preached the sermon, and the archbishop, in his address, informed the clergy that they had now an opportunity of reforming all ecclesiastical abuses and corruptions: he added, that the queen and the nobility were equally desirous of such a reformation. He then dismissed the lower house to choose its prolocutor, and they elected Alexander Nowell, lately made dean of Saint Paul's, to fill that honourable place.

The queen having granted a licence to the convocation to review the doctrine and discipline of the church, its doctrines were first taken into consideration, and the convocation proceeded with the articles as the parliament had proceeded with the liturgy. They took the articles of king Edward

\* Stat. 5 Elizabeth, c. 1.

\* Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker.

as the basis of the English confession, and made such alterations as the existing state of Christendom demanded. The alterations are neither few nor unimportant, and, where they are capable of historical illustration; will necessarily require explanation. If the records of the convocation had been preserved, it would have been easy to trace the variations between the articles of Edward and Elizabeth to their right source; but their cause must now be left to conjecture, in some cases probable, but never amounting to certainty. Some of the alterations, doubtless, must have originated in a change of opinion, and others in a change of circumstances. The extinction of old errors, or the introduction of new, must have rendered it expedient to soften certain articles, and to give a more determinate mode of expression to others.

A. D.  
1562.  
Elizabeth.

An appeal to the private sentiments of the reformers is not the safest method of ascertaining the grammatical construction or fixing the doubtful sense of a particular article; but it is an infallible criterion of the spirit and tendency of the whole confession. It is right, therefore, to state the characters of those who were engaged in the revival of the articles, and the circumstances in which the reformers were placed.

It has been already mentioned, that the articles of Edward were the work of Cranmer and Ridley; the articles of Elizabeth were framed by Parker, aided principally by Jewel. The articles of Edward were drawn up, as it has been seen, when the council of Trent was renewed under Julius the Third; the articles of Elizabeth were published,

1552.

CHAP.  
XVI.

1562.

when, after a long intermission, the Tridentine council re-assembled under the pontificate of Pius the Fourth. The reformers of Edward were too intimately connected with the foreign protestant churches to receive an invitation to assist in its deliberations; but Elizabeth, who followed the example of her father, experienced greater courtesy; and not only a papal nuncio was sent to solicit her attendance, but a personal solicitation was sent to Jewel. After the refusal of Elizabeth's council to suffer Martinengo to come into the kingdom, Scipio, a noble Venetian, a friend of Jewel, at Padua, laboured by a private application to gain that point, which the nuncio could not gain as a public minister\*. Scipio expostulated with Jewel on the singular conduct of the English nation, in taking no notice of the council of Trent; by neither sending representatives, nor excusing their absence; that it argued pride as well as schism not to appear at the council on the summons of the pope; that at Trent was assembled the learning of Christendom, and the piety of the catholic church; and that to adjust religious differences, as the English were about to settle them, was an attempt equally impious and fruitless.

Jewel, in his reply, disclaimed any participation in the late resolution of the English government of refusing to receive the nuncio; but freely delivered his sentiments on the propriety of that refusal. The English was not the only nation which refused to appear at the council of Trent, for the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria declined to come; and in Europe the king-

\* Life of Jewel.

doms of Sweden and Denmark, many of the Germanic states, and of the Swiss republics, had no representatives. Having defended the nation from the charge of singularity, he proved that its refusal was justified by the most cogent reasons. The ancient fathers always declined to appear at councils which were notoriously partial and prejudiced; and Jewel, after having adduced many instances, applied them to the case in point. He expressed his surprise that the pope should summon the English to the council, who had been pronounced heretics by his predecessor. In what character could they appear? Why must they take so long a journey to plead as criminals? They could expect only the alternative of being obliged to recant, or of incurring the anathema of the council\*.

A. D.  
1562.  

---

Elizabeth.

With this recorded protestation of Jewel against the authority of the council of Trent; with the indisputable fact, that he was principally concerned in forming the articles of Elizabeth; it is impossible to suppose that there was any disposition in the church of England to homology with the church of Rome. Whatever conciliation might be shown to the Romanists in the revisal of the liturgy, there was no concession of a single point of doctrine.

Thus the article of Elizabeth, "On the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation †," more directly opposes the council of Trent than the correspondent article of Edward‡. Both arti-

\* Epist. Jewel. It is inserted at the end of the History of the Council of Trent, by Sleidan; and also bound up with his Apology, in an edition printed in 1685.

† Art. 6.

‡ Art. 5.

CHAP.  
XVI.

cles affirm that the Scriptures are a complete rule of faith, and that the Christian religion is contained in them, and in them alone; but the article of Elizabeth distinguishes the canonical books of Scripture from the apocryphal, and the books belonging to each class are enumerated. The council of Trent has declared the canonical and apocryphal books of Scripture to be of equal authority, and to reduce them to a more palpable equality, the Romanists have intermingled them in their editions of the Old Testament. The English church on the contrary has classified the books of Scripture under the respective divisions of canonical and apocryphal, and has affirmed of the latter, that they are to be read "for example of life and instruction of manners," but not to be applied "to establish any doctrine."

All the articles of Edward, levelled against the errors of the church of Rome, such as that of purgatory \*, of works of supererogation †, of performing divine service in an unknown tongue ‡, of the nature and number of the sacraments §, have been retained in the articles of Elizabeth. The only article which has been selected to show that the reformers, on their revisal of Edward's articles, abated the terms of communion in favour of the papists, is that on the sacrament of the Lord's supper ||. It has been alleged that the article was mutilated to bring the Romanists into the communion of the church; that an express definition against the real presence was thought to be offensive to many of that persuasion; and therefore it was deemed sufficient to condemn transub-

\* Art. 14.

† Ibid. 22.

‡ Ibid. 24.

§ Ibid. 25.

|| Ibid. 28.

stantiation, and to affirm that Christ was present after a spiritual manner, and received by faith\*.

A. D.  
1562.

Elizabeth.

If the reformers of Elizabeth, in their abridgement of this article, were actuated by such an intention, they were not guided by their usual soundness of judgment: but that they had any such intention may be safely denied. The metaphysical argument of the impossibility that a human body should "be at one and the same time in many places," is by no means the strongest argument against transubstantiation. Metaphysical arguments might be applied with equal success to disprove any of the mysterious doctrines of Christianity. Why is Transubstantiation rejected, and the Trinity retained by the church of England? Not because the doctrine of the Trinity is within the reach of human comprehension, but because it is deducible "from the plain words of Scripture;" because it has been the belief of the primitive church, and because it is consistent with the scheme of human redemption. All these arguments Transubstantiation wants. It is "repugnant to the plain words of Scripture;" it "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament;" it cannot be proved to have been the belief of the Christian church for the first nine centuries, and it "hath given occasion to many superstitions." These arguments the article retains; to have urged more would have been undoubtedly superfluous; and to have omitted the weakest cannot be interpreted into a disposition to temporize. If this omission were one of those

\* Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. ii. b. 3. This he calls the *secret* of the omission.



CHAP. things which drove the ancient puritans out of the  
XVI. established church\*, it only proves their want of judgment, or their want of charity.

That no undue concession to the Romanists was intended is evident, from the circumstance that all the other articles of Edward were retained which are inconsistent with transubstantiation. To affirm that the wicked do not receive Christ's body and blood†, is the same thing with denying that Christ is corporally present in the sacrament. To affirm that both parts of the sacrament are "to be ministered to all Christian men alike‡," is to deny the Romish doctrine of concomitance, which is built on that of the corporal presence. To affirm that the one oblation of Christ is a perfect satisfaction for sin§, is to deny the sacrifice in the mass, and the use of private masses, which cannot subsist without transubstantiation.

Having thus considered the articles of Elizabeth in reference to the church of Rome, there are some other alterations which relate to controversies subsisting among protestants.

In the article of Edward, entitled "Of the going down of Christ into Hell||," a determinate sense was annexed to this fundamental tenet of the creed: it was added, that the body of Christ lay in the grave until his resurrection; but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in prison, or in hell, and there preached to them, according to the testimony of Saint Peter. The reformers of Elizabeth, whatever might be their

\* Confessional, c. 4. Note.

† Art. 29.

‡ Ibid. 30.

§ Ibid. 31.

|| Ibid. 3.

private interpretation of this article, avoided any authoritative explanation in an article of faith, and were satisfied simply to quote the words of the apostles' creed, without affixing to them a literal or a figurative meaning.

A. D.  
1562.  
Elizabeth.

A similar latitude of opinion was left by the reformers of Elizabeth on certain points, which the articles of Edward had decided in peremptory terms. The four last articles of Edward—"1. That the resurrection of the dead is not already past," as if the resurrection were spoken figuratively only of the soul; 2. That the souls of the deceased do not perish with their bodies, nor sleep without sense till the last day; 3. That the millennium is contrary to the Scriptures, and a Jewish dotage; 4. That all men shall at last be saved, though never so ungodly;"—were omitted by the reformers of Elizabeth. The reason of the omission was not that a decided change in opinion had taken place with respect to these points; but they either related to errors which, as they had been exploded, it was needless formally to condemn; or to questions on which difference of opinion might safely exist, and which ought to be left to private judgment.

The articles of Elizabeth, considered with respect to the controversies among protestants, enlarged the terms of communion, by their omissions of many points of doubtful disputation. The additions which they contain are not on points of a controversial nature; but it is necessary to advert to the enlargement of two articles, though on subjects widely different.

The twentieth article, "On the Authority of the

CHAP.  
XVI.

Church," is chiefly remarkable, because it has given rise to a charge of interpolation. In its present form it consists of two parts, the first asserting a power in the church to decree rites and ceremonies, and to judge in matters of faith; the second limiting this power, and submitting it to the rule of Scripture: but it has been disputed whether the first clause was originally a part of the article as drawn up by the reformers of Elizabeth. That the clause is not to be found in the corresponding article of Edward proves nothing against its genuineness: the strongest argument for its interpolation is its omission in the two manuscripts of the articles preserved in the library of Corpus Christi college, in the university of Cambridge. But that these manuscripts are originals is a point which remains to be proved; and it is certain that the questionable clause occurs in the earliest printed edition of the articles. The records of the convocation being destroyed, it is impossible now to appeal to an evidence which would be conclusive; but in the time of archbishop Laud these records were in existence, and when examined by him the clause was found, and they were afterwards inspected by Heylin, who confirms the testimony of Laud. Fuller declares that he is unable to decide the question; but Fuller is not superior to Heylin in candour, and far below him in accuracy. Besides, it is not certain that Fuller had the same privilege of perusing the records of convocation with Laud and Heylin. The diligent and impartial researches of Strype ended in favour of the genuineness of the clause. The question is now

purely one of literary curiosity, because the article with the disputed clause was afterwards confirmed by parliament.

A. D.  
1562.

Elizabeth.

The thirty-fifth article relates to the homilies. When the articles of Edward were compiled, there was but a single book, consisting only of twelve; but at the end there was an announcement that more were to follow\*. Another book was completed about the time of Edward's death, but was not published. The common error must therefore be corrected, that the second book of homilies was the work of Elizabeth's reign, and that Jewel was its principal composer: whereas it was the work of Edward's reign, and must be attributed to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer. In the thirty-fifth article, the titles of the second book of homilies are enumerated, and one historical observation must not be forgotten. The last homily, against rebellion, was not composed till some years after the articles had been confirmed by parliament, and it was then added to the others. From the homily itself, and from the prayer at its conclusion, it appears to have been penned after the rebellion of the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, at a time when the nation was suffering under a civil war.

After repeating that the design of this work does not embrace an exposition of the articles, and that the observations already offered have an historical reference, it remains to be observed, that the articles were concluded, and the subscription finished, in the chapter-house of Saint Paul's, in the ninth

\* Hereafter shall follow sermons of fasting, prayer, alms-deeds, &c. Postscript to first book of homilies, p. 146, 8vo. Oxford edit. 1822.

CHAP.  
XVI.

Jan. 29.

session of the convocation \*. All the bishops of the province of Canterbury subscribed, except those of Gloucester and Rochester, who were absent, and of the lower house there were above one hundred names. Among the subscribers were several of the learned exiles, who were afterwards conspicuous in the ranks of nonconformity.

The next subject which came under the consideration of the convocation were the rites and ceremonies of the church. Sandys, bishop of Worcester, moved, that a paper of advice might be presented to the queen on the following points: that private baptism, and baptism by women, might be taken out of the common prayer book: that the cross in baptism might be disallowed as needless and superstitious; and that commissioners might be appointed to reform the ecclesiastical laws†.

Another paper was afterwards presented to the house with the following articles of petition, subscribed by thirty-three names: that the psalms might be sung distinctly by the whole congregation, and that organs might be laid aside; that none of the laity might be allowed to baptize, and that the use of the cross might be discontinued in the sacrament of baptism; that kneeling at the eucharist might be left at the discretion of the ordinary; that the use of copes and surplices might be discontinued; that the ministers of the word and sacraments might not be compelled to use such habits as the enemies of Christ's gospel have chosen to

\* Strype's Annals, vol. i. folio edition.

† Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. b. 6. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.

be the special array of their priesthood; that the clause in the thirty-third article, which censured such as did not conform to the public order, might be mitigated; and that all festivals kept in honour of the saints might be abrogated, or at least commemorated only in sermons, homilies, or prayers illustrative of their history, and that, after having attended public service on those days, the people might be allowed to work\*.

A. D.  
1562.

Elizabeth.

This paper being disapproved, another, containing a modification of the preceding articles, was brought into the lower house. It went to abrogate all festivals, except Sundays and principal feasts observed in honour of Christ: it recommended that in reading divine service the minister should turn his face towards the people, that the people might hear and be edified: it allowed the use of the surplice in reading prayers, and only abolished the cope and the other sacerdotal vestments.

Feb. 13.

These articles were warmly contested in the lower house; and some of the members were willing to refer the controversy to the decision of the prelates. Others protested against such a compromise, and declared a resolution to resist any innovation on the book of common prayer, and on the rules, rites, and ceremonies prescribed by it. When the question was put to the vote, it appears that the innovators formed a considerable part of the assembly, and that the English exiles had brought back a predilection for the discipline of

\* Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. b. 6. Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.

CHAP.  
XVI.

---

the foreign churches. On a scrutiny, the approvers of the propositions who were present exceeded the other party by a majority of eight\*; but when the proxies were counted, the scale was turned, and the propositions were rejected by a majority of one. The prolocutor, Nowell, divided with the favourers of the innovations. It is not to be supposed that, if the affirmative vote had been carried, the alterations would have taken place: it might have been followed by an address from the lower house of convocation to the queen, and there the matter would have terminated†.

Feb. 26. This contest in the lower house impeded the business of convocation during several days; and after a subsidy had been granted, a book of discipline was brought to the upper house by the prolocutor of the lower, accompanied by ten other members. The book was referred to the archbishop, and the bishops of London, Winchester, Chichester, Hereford, and Ely. The prolocutor then brought up some additional articles relating to discipline, and the archbishop delivered to him the former book to be reconsidered. What this book of discipline was does not clearly appear, for the convocation was prorogued before the book was confirmed.

April 10. In this convocation, a Latin catechism on a more comprehensive plan than that of Edward the Sixth, and intended for the use of schools, was composed

\* Forty-three to thirty-five, present, in favour of innovation; fifty-nine to fifty-eight, including proxies, in favour of the established order. Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.

† Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. iii. b. 6.

by the prolocutor, Alexander Nowell. He engaged in the undertaking by the advice of Cecil, to whom the work was dedicated; and it being submitted to the lower house of convocation, that assembly gave to the performance of its president the sanction of its approbation. But there is no evidence that the catechism was submitted to the upper house of convocation, and it never obtained a place among the authorized formularies of the church. The statement is erroneous, that the catechism of Nowell was reviewed and sanctioned by the same convocation which reviewed and sanctioned the articles \*; and it is not partially but totally erroneous. The articles were reviewed by the archbishops and bishops alone; and it does not appear that they were submitted to the lower house, except for the purpose of being subscribed. The catechism was composed by the prolocutor of the lower house at the solicitation of Cecil: it was reviewed and corrected by that house; but was never sanctioned, or, perhaps, even revised by the prelates. Whatever may be its merit, it has no other weight than that which it derives from the deserved reputation of its author, and from the suffrages of other names of high estimation. These testimonies it undoubtedly possesses; and among them the encomium of Whitgift is not the least valuable, that there is no one so well instructed who may not derive benefit from the repeated perusal of so learned and necessary a book.

What Nowell's catechism has been inaccurately represented to be, that Jewel's Apology really is,

A. D.  
1562.  
Elizabeth.

\* Daubeny's *Vindiciæ*, p. 113.



CHAP.  
XVI.

an accredited and public confession of the catholic and Christian faith of the church of England. It is not to be considered as the unauthorized work of an eminent prelate; but as an authentic exposition of the doctrines of that church whose name it bears. It was published by the express command of the queen, and at the royal expense; and it expressed with such fidelity and force the sentiments of the English hierarchy, that Parker designed it as an accompaniment to the articles.

The design of the Apology is twofold: first, to state the reasons of the separation of the English church from that of Rome; and, secondly, to answer the calumnies which, on account of that separation, had been raised against the English nation. Like the articles, it appeared during the last meeting of the council of Trent, and its seasonable publication excited a general attention to its arguments. The character which the biographer of Jewel has given of the Apology cannot be expressed better than in his own language. "It is so drawn, that the first part of the work is an illustration, and, as it were, a paraphrase, of the twelve articles of the Christian faith contained in the creed; the second is a short and solid confutation of whatever is objected against the church. If the arrangement be considered, nothing can be better distributed; if the perspicuity, nothing can be more clear; if the style, nothing can be more terse; if the diction, nothing can be more splendid; if the arguments, nothing can be stronger\*."

\* Humfrey's Life of Jewel.

The Apology was composed by its author in the Latin language; of which he was a complete master\*; but it was soon translated into the German, Italian, French, Spanish, Dutch, and even into the Welsh tongue†. There was also a Greek version; and that it might obtain a popular circulation, it was translated into English by lady Bacon, wife of the lord-keeper, and a daughter of sir Anthony Cook.

A. D.  
1562.  
Elizabeth.

Among the testimonies of approbation received by Jewel, none could be so gratifying as that of Peter Martyr. The connexion between these two eminent divines began with the early youth of Jewel, and it was terminated only by the death of Martyr. But the foreign professor lived to read the immortal work of his once favourite pupil, and to stamp on it the seal of his testamentary commendation‡. He was enabled to transmit not only his own heartfelt commendations, but the approving sentence of the foreign reformers. “I am pleased with all that you do,” was the affectionate congratulation of Martyr, on reading the production of that genius which he had fostered and formed; but the praises of Bullinger, of Gualter, and of Wolfius, not being dictated by partiality for the author, were an evidence of the merit of the work. “You have,” continued Martyr, “by this your most elegant and learned Apology, raised such a hope in the minds of all good and

Aug. 24.

\* “In the disputation at Westminster, ye would seem to stand in doubt, whether we would be able to understand you or not, when ye spake a little Latin.” Jewel’s answer to Cole.

† By M. Kyffin, printed at Oxford, 1571.

‡ Peter Martyr died, November, 1562.

CHAP.  
XVI.

---

learned men, that they generally promise themselves the reformed religion will never want an advocate against its enemies while you live. And truly I am extremely glad that I have the happiness to see the day which made you the parent of so famous and eloquent a performance. May the God of Heaven, of his goodness, grant that you may be blessed in time with many more such \* !”

After the revisal of the liturgy and of the articles, and after the apologetical confession of Jewel, it remained to provide for general use a more correct version of the Holy Scriptures. This pious task had been the employment and the solace of the exiles at Geneva; and the divines who were engaged in it were contented to prolong the period of their banishment from their native country, in order that they might witness its completion †. The Genevan translators compared the old English Bible of Tindal, first with the Hebrew original, and then with the best modern translations; they divided the chapters into verses, which former translators had not done; and, lastly, they added figures, maps, tables, and annotations. It was published at the commencement of Elizabeth’s reign, with a dedication to the queen, and an epistle to the reader.

As soon as the translation circulated in England, the dedication and the notes occasioned great

\* Peter Martyr’s letter, in the *Life of Jewel*, prefixed to his *Apology*.

† The divines engaged in it were Knox, Coverdale, Goodman, Gibbs, Samson, William Cole, and Whittingham. It was first printed in 1560.

dissatisfaction. In the dedication, and the prefatory epistle, the discipline and ceremonies of the church of England were severely reprehended, as being no better than remnants of popery. The notes were still more offensive \*; for some of them were thought derogatory to the royal prerogative, and others were pointed against episcopacy. The Genevan translation, so far from finding a favourable reception with the church of England, was not, for many years, suffered to be reprinted by public authority. Until an authorized translation could be completed, the old translation of Tindal and Coverdale was reprinted for general use. The bishops were directed to undertake a new version, which, though not finished for some years afterwards, was begun at this time. At this period, therefore, an account of the Bishops' Bible will be inserted with propriety.

A. D.  
1562.  
Elizabeth.

Parker, whose proficiency in antiquarian learning had been singularly useful in reforming the calendar, and in arranging suitable lessons for the Sundays and holidays, had the chief direction of the new translation. It was his province to divide the Old and New Testaments into portions, and to assign a separate portion to the different translators. Though not exclusively, yet it was principally the work of the English bishops; and the bishops of London, Ely, Norwich, Lichfield, Chi-

\* The exceptionable notes were on Exodus, ch. xv. v. 19, and 2 Chron. ch. xix. v. 16, as encouraging resistance and rebellion. The note on Revelation, ch. ix. v. 3, was against the episcopal order, where the locusts that come out of the smoke are said to be heretics, false teachers, worldly subtle prelates, with monks, friars, cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, doctors, bachelors, and masters.

CHAP.  
XVI.

---

chester, Worcester, Winchester, and Saint David's, are recorded as the chief agents. When it was published, it had a preface by Parker, and the initial letters of every translator's name were subjoined to his respective portion. The Bishops' Bible was used in the public service of the church nearly forty years, while the Genevan Bible, being more accordant to the opinions which were acquiring strength, was chiefly read in private\*.

Such was the settlement of the ecclesiastical polity under the wise counsels of Elizabeth, displaying throughout its progressive steps "the moderation of the church of England." It preserved an equal distance from Rome and Geneva, and thus secured stability and permanence. By retaining the episcopal form of church government, and the primitive liturgy, Elizabeth, as her most virulent enemy confesses, gave strength and perpetuity to the English schism†. The moderate and reasonable members of the Romish communion were conciliated by the prudence of the queen, and the earliest divisions of her reign originated in a different source, in clamours raised by unquiet spirits, not for essentials, but for matters confessedly indifferent. These divisions it is the painful duty of the historian to relate, and their fatal effects on the peace of the church and of the civil government.

\* Bishop Gray's Key to the Old Testament, Introduction.

† Sanders de Schism. Ang.

## CHAPTER XVII.

**Origin and Progress of Puritanism.—Cecil's Address to the Queen.—Many of the Clergy refuse to wear the Habits.—Case of Samson and Humfreys.—Their Correspondence with the foreign Reformers.—Puritans take Advantage of a papal Bull to the University of Cambridge, and are licensed as Preachers.—First Separation of the Puritans from the Church.—Conduct of the See of Rome.—Rebellion of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland.—Bull of Pius the Fifth.—Increase of Puritanism.—Cartwright.—Parliament and Convocation meet.—Proceedings in both.—Jewel's Sermon at Saint Paul's Cross against the Puritans.—Death of Jewel.**

THE origin of puritanism is traced to the divisions between those English protestants, who, to save their lives from the tyranny of Mary, found an asylum in Germany; some of the exiles adhering to the liturgy of king Edward as the religion of their own country, and others imitating the forms of those churches among whom they lived\*. Germany, then, must be denominated the birth-place and the cradle of English puritanism; for it would be a dereliction of candour to seek any extraction more ignoble than that which its followers have assumed, and in which they have always gloried. The name of puritans, derived from the Puritani or Cathari of the third century, was first imposed as a term of reproach on the English

A. D.  
1564.  
Elizabeth.

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. Preface.

CHAP.  
XVII.

sectarians of the sixteenth; but was afterwards retained by themselves as proper enough to express their desires of a more pure form of worship and discipline in the church\*.

That the schism in the church of England which began with the reign of Elizabeth had its rise in a difference of opinion concerning rites and ceremonies, is a fact not reluctantly acknowledged, but obtrusively displayed by the puritanical historians. But a schism occasioned by a diversity in public worship, and opposition with respect to ceremonies, proved infinitely more pernicious than if it had arisen in any contrariety of doctrine. Its effects were open to common observation, and were immediately visible in the irregularities attendant on the celebration of divine offices, irregularities tending to bring all public worship into contempt.

1564.

This great practical evil was forced on the notice of Cecil, and was by him submitted to the queen; and he thus faithfully represented the irreverend and incongruous manner in which the services of the church were performed: "Some perform divine service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church; some in a seat made in the church; some in the pulpit, with their faces to the people; some keep precisely to the order of the book, others intermix psalms in metre; some officiate with a surplice, and others without it. In some places the table stands in the body of the church, in others it stands in the chancel; in some places it stands altarwise, distant from the wall a yard; in others it stands in the middle of the

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. Preface.

chancel, north and south; in some places the table is joined, in others it stands upon tressels; in some the table has a carpet, in others none. Some administer the communion with surplice and cap, some with surplice alone, some with neither; some with chalice, others with a communion cup; some with unleavened bread, others with leavened; some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting; some baptize in a font, others in a basin; some sign with the sign of a cross, others make no sign; some administer in a surplice, others without; some with a square cap, some with a round cap, some with a button cap, some with a hat, some in scholar's clothes, some in others \*."

A. D.  
1564.

Elizabeth.

Feb. 24.

This representation bears the marks of Cecil's official accuracy, and as it was not exaggerated, was received by the queen with attention. Her displeasure was excited by this total want of decency and uniformity, and she directed the two archbishops to confer with the ecclesiastical commissions, and to institute an inquiry into the prevailing diversities in rites, ceremonies, or doctrine. The bishops were commanded to restore an exact uniformity in all external ordinances, as they were established by law or custom, and they were to admit no one to any ecclesiastical preferment, unless he was disposed to observe good discipline, and formally promised to comply with it.

Many of the bishops had at first entertained scruples concerning the propriety of those ceremonies which the queen had determined to retain,

\* Strype's Life of Parker, and Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.



CHAP.  
XVII.

and particularly of the habits. But however strong might be their scruples, they differed from their weaker brethren, in preferring to comply, rather than to desert their ministry. They obeyed the law, thinking that obedience was not sinful; and they had reason to apprehend, that if they left their stations on account of their nonconformity to indifferent things, their enemies would supply their places\*. Still they had a tenderness for those who conscientiously refused to comply, and Pilkington, Oct. 25. bishop of Durham, particularly exerted himself to obtain some relaxation in their favour. In a letter to the earl of Leicester, he pleaded, "that by straining the point of conformity, many worthy men would be lost for trifles, and many parishes disfurnished of a preacher." But his own compliance abated the force of his reasoning, and he showed that "his compassion was stronger than his logic†." Whittingham, dean of Durham, well known in the troubles of Frankfort, wrote to the same nobleman, and he argued with more consistency and strength, because his practice was conformable with his sentiments.

The interference of the earl of Leicester softened the queen's inflexibility, and though the ecclesiastical commissioners, at her command, promulgated articles of conformity‡, yet she refused to confirm them. The dissenters, having some of the courtiers in their interest, refused submission, and

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.

† Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. b. 6.

‡ Or advertisements. They are contained in Bishop Sparrow's Collections.

Parker could not refrain from openly complaining of the tergiversation of the court \*. It would have been better if nothing had been attempted, because the dissenters were provoked, instead of being reformed. Notwithstanding this want of support from royal authority, himself and the rest of the commissioners were resolved to perform their duty, and to proceed against the non-compliers.

A. D.  
1565.

Elizabeth.

Among those divines who were the most inflexible in refusing to comply with the discipline of the church were Samson and Humfreys. Each of them held a distinguished station in the university of Oxford, Samson being the dean of Christchurch, and Humfreys the president of Magdalen-college, and regius professor of divinity. They were men of considerable learning, but their prejudices were stronger than their reason: they had both been exiles, and were, consequently, known to the foreign reformers. Parker, therefore, thought that the judgment of Bucer and Martyr might have some weight, and urged their opinion in the case of Hooper; but to such authorities Samson and Humfreys were impenetrable. After a long attendance, and receiving many severe admonitions from the council, they framed a supplicatory letter in Latin, addressed to the archbishop and the other commissioners. They protested before God, what an affliction it was to them, that there should be such dissensions about a cap and surplice among persons of the same faith. But "conscience," they observed, "is a tender thing, and all men cannot look upon the same things as in-

March 20.

\* Strype's Life of Parker.

CHAP.  
XVII.

different: if, therefore, these habits seem so to you, you are not to be condemned by us; on the other hand, if they do not appear so to us, we ought not to be vexed by you\*.”

1565.

While their case was under discussion, they attempted to fortify their opinion by the suffrage of some of the most eminent among the foreign divines. Horn, bishop of Winchester, had been the organ of the nonconformists, and had laid before Gualter and Bullinger the difficulties and the dissensions which prevailed in the church. The answers of these foreigners show an admirable temper, when it is considered, that the ceremonies of which the English dissenters complained were not practised in the foreign churches. Bullinger, in particular, used irresistible arguments to convince the nonconformists, as well as the most urgent persuasions to gain their compliance†.

Nov. 3.

When Samson and Humfreys understood in what manner Bullinger and Gualter had answered the complaints of Horn, they transmitted a prolix justification of their nonconformity. Their letters were noticed with due respect by Bullinger, yet he was not inclined, by any reasons which they had offered, to retract his former judgment. All their objections had been fully stated by Horn, and they had been answered; if the answers were not satisfactory, he had only to express his sorrow. To controversies of that kind he had a great dislike, and never willingly interfered in them. But he

1566.  
May.

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.

† Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. iii. b. 6. Appendix, No 76.

could not forbear, on their requisition, to repeat his opinion, that laws might be prescribed concerning the habits of the clergy, and that these laws might be in conformity with the advice of the apostle. Saint Paul said, that a bishop ought to be decent\*, a word applicable to the habit as well as the demeanour. Regulations of this sort were not a revival of the Levitical law, for every ceremony practised by the Jews ought not to be called Levitical. The apostles commanded the Christian converts to abstain from things strangled and from blood. The maintenance of the clergy by tithes was derived from the Jews; from them also was derived the use of psalms in divine worship; so that a conformity to the institutions of Moses is not of itself a valid reason for the rejection of any practice. Neither ought the use of the sacerdotal habits to be called a conformity to popery, nor to be rejected merely because they are used by papists; for, by the same reason, it would be right to desert churches, to receive no stipend for the performance of ministerial offices, to discontinue baptism, to disuse the apostolic and Nicene creeds, and at length to reject the Lord's prayer. The habits were not enjoined from superstitious motives, but on the grounds of decency and unity. He ended his letter with an earnest persuasion to all the dissentients to consider seriously, whether it would not be more conducive to edification to use the prescribed habits on these grounds only, than to see the fold of Christ desolated, if not by wolves, yet by careless and unfaithful shepherds†?

A. D.  
1566.

---

Elizabeth.

\* Κοσμιος.

† Burnet's Hist. of the Reform. vol. iii. b. 6. App. No. 77.

CHAP.  
XVII.

---

A copy of this letter was sent to Horn, and both Grindal and himself, thinking that it would operate irresistibly in settling the minds of many weak though conscientious men, issued an order for its publication. But Samson and Humfreys were dissatisfied at those clear arguments and temperate remonstrances by which their own conduct was condemned. They complained to Bullinger of the publication of his letter, and carried their objections against the ecclesiastical polity of England to a greater length. They expressed their dislike of the music in cathedrals, and their disapprobation of organs; they dissented from the practice of sponsors in baptism, and to the signing the cross in that sacrament; and they inveighed with great warmth against the abuses of the ecclesiastical courts.

July. Bullinger and Gualter rejoined, and preserving their former moderation, reminded their angry correspondents, that they should not have given their opinion if it had not been solicited. They were not sanguine enough to expect that their answer would be completely satisfactory, but had no expectation that it would have given offence. They were resolved to engage no farther in the controversy: as for the habits, they still thought it better to use them than to desert the ministry: Sept. 10. farther than this they would not go, and protested against giving any countenance or approbation to popish defilements and superstitions. The other matters of complaint were of a graver nature than about surplices or copes, and they trusted that their defence of the habits might not be construed into a defence of any real abuse or error. But it should

be ever remembered, that the unity of the church was broken by nothing more frequently than by an overbearing and impetuous temper. It was not only necessary that the end be good, but that it be prosecuted by prudent means\*.

A. D.  
1566.  
Elizabeth.

Perceiving that the division was likely to be extended to other matters than the vestments, Bullinger and Gualter thought that they might render their friends an effectual service by soliciting the interposition of the earl of Bedford. They stated to this nobleman, that when they first heard of the contention, they feared that it would increase, and bring greater evil on the church. As to the habits, they had always expressed their opinion, that it was not right in the clergy to desert their stations for a matter so unimportant. They were sorry that a private letter of theirs should have been printed, and they were still more grieved, that their defence of the vestments should have been construed into a defence of other abuses, which they could not by any means approve. They implored him to intercede with the queen and nobility for an indulgence towards those weaker members of the church, whose errors proceeded from an excess of zeal, and an ardent love of spiritual religion†.

Sept. 11.

With Horn and Grindal they also remonstrated on the impropriety of publishing a letter intended only for private use. They had no wish to aggravate the contentions in England, but would exert themselves to mitigate such unhappy disputes; and they repeated their protestation against affording any countenance to superstition or error‡.

\* Burnet's Hist. of the Reform. vol. iii. b. 6. App. No. 80.

† Ibid. App. No. 81.

‡ Ibid. App. No. 82.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Sept. 6.

The two English prelates defended themselves from any dishonourable motive in printing the letter. When it was published, the names of the persons to whom it was addressed were suppressed, and its publication had been attended by the most salutary effects. It had satisfied and settled the minds of many who were on the point of leaving the communion of the church; and even the most violent were so far convinced by its arguments, that they were either silent, or less clamorous in their opposition than formerly. A few divines had been ejected from their stations, but only a few; and, whatever might be their sincerity, these were not distinguished for learning: Samson was the only ejected minister who merited the appellation of learned. Humfrey still continued in his place, with the most eminent of the nonconformists.

Feb. 6.

Grindal and Horn were not satisfied with vindicating their personal conduct in publishing Bullinger's letter; they proceeded to vindicate the polity of the English church. They maintained that the vestments might be lawfully used, on the ground of decency and order; their opponents denied that the vestments were a matter of indifference, because of their former popish and idolatrous use. But if the vestments were rejected on this account, the priesthood might for the same reason be rejected; for it was derived from popery, or from a mixture of popery and Lutheranism\*. As to the other complaints of the nonconformists, some were more reasonable. Organs and figured

\* Papisticum profectò vel saltem Lutherano-papisticum haberemus ministerium, aut omnino nullam. Burnet's Hist. of the Reform. vol. iii. b. 6. App. No. 83.

music were not approved by Grindal and Horn ; the baptism of infants by women they strongly opposed. The practice of sponsors they submitted to, as a temporary evil, to be rectified in better times : that of kneeling at the communion was permitted, after a caution that no adoration of the elements was intended.

A. D.  
1567.  
Elizabeth.

In the conclusion of their letter, they noticed one calumnious insinuation, which had been industriously propagated, and with too great success, that the whole ecclesiastical government was in the hands of the bishops. This assertion was evidently false ; for although a priority was given to the episcopal order, yet in the national synod, convened by a royal edict, the inferior clergy triply exceeded the bishops, and a free licence was granted to every member to deliver his opinion. A farther reformation was sincerely wished by Grindal and Horn, and they had laboured to promote it : they would not relax in their future efforts, but would persevere, even if perseverance were unattended with success. Their aim was to correct and amend all abuses and errors by the standard of the word of God.

As Samson and Humfreys were the most eminent among the non-compliers, the strongest exertions were used to secure their conformity, both by argument and intimidation. The ecclesiastical commissioners were divided as to the measures necessary to be adopted ; some were in favour of a compromise, and others of connivance ; but Parker, who was at the head of the high commission court, would abate nothing of the queen's injunctions. Both Humfreys and Samson were placed under



CHAP.  
XVII.

confinement, but the largest measure of severity was apportioned to Samson. By a special order from the queen, he was deprived of his deanery; but, as a proof of Parker's lenity, it should be recorded, that, by his interposition, some favour was shown towards the ejected dean by the chapter of Christchurch; and the primate also earnestly solicited Cecil, that "as the queen's pleasure had been executed for example and terror to others, it might be mollified to the commendation of her clemency." The royal displeasure was in time mitigated, and Samson was appointed a prebendary in Saint Paul's cathedral, and was permitted to hold the lectureship in divinity of Whittingdon college in London. Humfreys resigned his place in the university of Oxford; but his interest at court was so powerful, that he obtained a toleration for his nonconformity, until, by the solicitations of Cecil, he was persuaded to wear the habits. Preferment more valuable than that which he had relinquished awaited his declining years, and a successive appointment to the deaneries of Gloucester and Winchester rewarded the chaplain and biographer of Jewel\*.

1576.

1564.

While the case of the Oxford divines was under consideration, Parker was endeavouring to bring the London clergy to conformity, but a similar spirit of resistance was displayed. The archbishop had vainly endeavoured to obtain from the queen a relaxation of the royal injunctions relating to clerical apparel, but Elizabeth was not to be moved from her resolution. A proclamation was issued

\* Maddox's Vindication against Neal, p. 324. Strype's Life of Parker.

by her command, peremptorily requiring an uniformity of habit, on pain of prohibition from preaching, and of deprivation. In consequence of this proclamation, the archbishop, with the consent of the other members of the high commission court, summoned the whole body of the London clergy to appear before him at Lambeth, to receive their answer to the question, Whether they would promote conformity to the apparel as it was prescribed by law, and would testify their promise by subscription? Those who demurred were immediately to be suspended from preaching, and after three months, if they persisted in their contumacy, to be deprived. To prepare the way for this general citation, Fox the martyrologist was summoned separately, from an expectation that he might be induced to conform, and that his conformity would have a powerful effect on others. But when his subscription was demanded, he took from his pocket his Greek Testament, and said, "To this I will subscribe." When the canons were exhibited to him, he refused his signature or assent. "I have nothing," he said, "but a prebend in the church of Salisbury, and much good may it do you, if you take it from me\*." It is equally honourable to Fox, to the queen, and to the English prelacy, that the venerable nonconformist was suffered to remain in the unmolested enjoyment of his humble preferment, and of his inoffensive prejudices. If he endured poverty, he escaped persecution.

A. D.  
1564.

Elizabeth.

On the day appointed for the appearance of the March 26.

\* Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.

CHAP.  
XVII.

London clergy, the archbishop desired the aid of the secretary of state, with some of the nobility and privy council; but they refused to be present. Sixty-one out of a hundred were induced to subscribe, and thirty-seven gave an absolute refusal. The recusants were immediately suspended, with an admonition that deprivation would ensue, if they did not conform within three months. The non-conforming ministers delivered a paper, containing the reasons of their refusal.

That the royal injunctions might extend beyond incumbents and curates, the archbishop revoked all licences for preaching, and obliged all preachers to renew them. Those ministers who refused to conform travelled about the kingdom, preaching in those churches where they could find admission, as if they had been apostles\*.

There was still one door of entrance into the pulpit left open to the puritanical ministers, and which Parker unsuccessfully attempted to close. There was a privilege granted to the university of Cambridge by pope Alexander the Sixth, empowering that academical body to license twelve ministers yearly, who might preach in any part of England without leave of the bishop of the diocese or the archbishop of the province, and the licence was to continue as long as life. The puritans, when it suited their purpose, were not reluctant to shelter themselves under the authority of a papal bull; and it was without effect that Parker applied to Cecil, the chancellor of the university, praying

\* Bishop Jewel, quoted by Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, vol. i. c. 4.

him to set aside so disorderly a practice. The vice-chancellor was cited to defend the privileges of the university, which he did so entirely to the satisfaction of Cecil, that the obnoxious privilege was confirmed\*.

A. D.  
1565.  
Elizabeth.

Cambridge had long been the favoured seat of puritanical disaffection, and the question of the vestments had been debated there with considerable warmth. Longworth, the master of Saint John's college, being absent on some particular occasion, the students of that house, to the number of three hundred, came to chapel on a festival day without their hoods and surplices, and continued in the practice for some time; the master on his return making no complaint, nor endeavouring to bring them back to conformity. In Trinity college all the students except three declared against the use of the surplice, and many in other colleges were ready to follow the example. Intelligence of this violation of discipline having been sent to Cecil, the chancellor, he admonished the vice-chancellor and the other heads of colleges, as they tendered the honour of God, the preservation of Christian unity, the reputation of the university, the favour of the queen, and his own good will, that they should return to their former usages, and continue to wear the prescribed habits. The heads of some colleges interceded for an indulgence to those who had conscientious scruples, but the intercession was rejected with manifestations of displeasure. Longworth, in whose college the breach of discipline began, was cited before the court of high com-

\* Strype's Life of Parker. Bishop Maddox's Vindication against Neal.

CHAP. mission, and was obliged to sign and read a public  
XVII. recantation \*.

Every application to the queen and the commissioners for a relaxation of the injunctions having proved ineffectual, the deprived ministers published  
1566. a vindication of their conduct. The bishops were not slow in answering the arguments of their antagonists; but the high commissioners went farther, and resorted to an expedient which need not have been adopted, because it is the resource of those who are conscious of the weakness of their cause. They imposed more severe restraints on the liberty  
June 29. of the press, and decreed that no book should be published or printed against the queen's injunctions, that all offenders should be punished by imprisonment and forfeiture of their books, and that the wardens of the company of stationers should be empowered to search all suspected places, and to seize all obnoxious books. This decree was signed by eight of the privy council, in addition to seven of the high commissioners.

This arbitrary measure accelerated the open separation of the non-conformists from the church. After waiting two months in the hope that some tenderness might be shown towards their scruples, several of the deprived ministers held a consultation with their friends and followers. After prayer to God, and serious deliberation among themselves, they came to a resolution, that as they could not have the word of God preached, nor the sacraments administered, without the idolatrous vestments; and since there had been a separate con-

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.

gregation, in London as well as at Geneva, which used a form of worship and discussion approved by Calvin himself; it was therefore their duty to separate from the public churches, and to assemble as they could find opportunity, in private houses or elsewhere, to worship God in a manner which might not offend against the light of their conscience\*.

A. D.  
1566.

Elizabeth.

It was a matter of some discussion, whether they should continue to use as much of the liturgy as they were able conscientiously to approve, or whether, since they were in a state of separation, they should at once establish a form of worship more consonant to the holy Scriptures and the practice of foreign churches. The last alteration was adopted, and, accordingly, the English liturgy was entirely rejected, and the Genevan service-book substituted in its place.

It has been more than once asserted, by the advocates of puritanical separation, that the puritans would have continued within the church, if they could have obtained indulgence for their scruples concerning the habits and some other ceremonies. But when the separation had been effected, it was discovered that they entertained other and graver objections against the ecclesiastical establishment†. This amounts to an acknowledgment that they would have sacrificed their conscientious and substantial reasons of dissent, if they could have been indulged in matters which they repeatedly affirmed were indifferent, or at least unessential.

A concealed dislike of episcopacy was the spring

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 4.

† Ibid, vol. i. c. 5.

CHAP.  
XVII.

---

which prompted all their measures, and no sooner had the separation taken place, than this secret disaffection was vented in acts of open hostility. Then their objections were set in full array, and displayed in formidable regularity. 1. They complained that bishops affected to be a superior order to presbyters, claiming the sole right of ordination, and of exercising discipline; and they disapproved of the temporal dignities annexed to the episcopal office. 2. They excepted to the titles and offices of archdeacons, deans, and chapters, as having no foundation in Scripture or primitive antiquity. 3. They complained of the exorbitant power and jurisdiction of the spiritual courts, as being derived from the canon law, and not from the word of God, though they allowed the necessity, and lamented the want of a godly and primitive discipline. 4. Though they admitted the lawfulness of forms of prayer, yet they contended for an occasional liberty of using unpremeditated prayer, or a prayer composed by the minister; and in the English liturgy, they objected to the frequent repetition of the Lord's prayer, and the interruptions in the other prayers by responses. 5. They disliked the practice of reading the apocryphal Scriptures in the church; and though they did not altogether disapprove of homilies, yet they thought that no man should be a minister of the gospel who was incapable of expounding the Scriptures. 6. They condemned the observance of festivals or holidays, of keeping Lent, as being unwarranted by Scripture. 7. They disallowed the cathedral mode of worship, the chanting the prayers and the antiphone, which the reformers of Edward

disapproved; and they condemned all musical instruments, particularly organs, which were not in use during the first twelve centuries. 8. They scrupled to conform to certain rites and ceremonies; such as the cross in baptism, the practice of sponsors, the mode of administering confirmation, kneeling at the communion, bowing at the name of Jesus, the ring in marriage, and, lastly, the use of the surplice. These things, they alleged, gave offence to weak minds; and therefore these abuses, every one, in his station and according to his ability, should labour to reform; ministers by the word, magistrates by authority, and the people by prayer\*.

A. D.  
1566.

Elizabeth.

The leaders of the original separation were not men of high attainments, because the most eminent of the puritanical ministers still remained within the pale of the church. Soon however they increased in numbers and consideration; and while they weakened the church by open schism, or distracted it by internal broils, the church of Rome turned these divisions to her own advantage. A sudden illness of Elizabeth, and the prospective succession of the queen of Scotland, infused sanguine hope into the hitherto quiescent papists; and the dangers which impended over the protestant cause were not lessened by the compulsory renunciation by Mary of the Scottish crown, by the abolition of the papal jurisdiction in Scotland, and by the imprisonment of the Scottish queen in the English dominions. The Romish party was inspirited by certain pretended prophecies that the reign of

1568.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 5.



CHAP.  
XVII.

Elizabeth should not exceed twelve years; and its numbers being formidable, as well as widely spread, it was not easily suppressed by the existing laws. In Lancashire the common prayer-book was laid aside, the churches shut up, and the mass was celebrated openly\*. As Cambridge was the seat of puritanism, so Oxford was overrun with papists. Two of the colleges, New college and Corpus Christi, were so far addicted to the church of Rome, that their visitor, the bishop of Winchester, was refused admittance, and his entrance was at last effected by force. Great numbers of papists were harboured in the inns of court, expecting with impatience the death of Elizabeth, and the succession of the presumptive heir, Mary, queen of Scotland.

The earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland had long been suspected of disaffection, and were commanded to appear at court to exculpate themselves from the charge; but, instead of obeying the summons, they collected their partisans to the number of four thousand, and avowed their intention of restoring the Romish religion, and of liberating the queen of the Scots. Having organized an army, they entered the city of Durham, and restored the mass in all the churches. But as the English army under the command of the duke of Suffolk advanced, the insurgents dispersed without even hazarding a battle. The earl of Northumberland was apprehended within the Scottish dominions, delivered to the English by the earl of Murray, and executed at York. The earl of

\* Strype's Annals, vol. i. fol. ed.

Westmoreland escaped into Flanders, and died in poverty\*.

A. D.  
1569.

---

Elizabeth.

The Romanists throughout England were far from joining in this desperate attempt, and even offered to their protestant sovereign aid against the rebels of their own religion; but the jesuits, being defeated in their military warfare, resolved on a more secret but sure method of assailing the church and kingdom. They projected the foundation of foreign seminaries for the education of English missionaries, who might afterwards return to their native country and propagate their faith. A college was in this year founded at Douay, under the patronage of Philip the Second, king of Spain, of which William Allen, afterwards promoted to the rank of a cardinal, was appointed the superior.

And now the court of Rome, exasperated by the assistance which Elizabeth had lately rendered to the Hugonots, resolved to proceed to extremities, and to declare her excommunicated. By virtue of a bull of pope Pius the fifth, Elizabeth, pretended queen of England, and all heretics adhering to her, were solemnly anathematized, her subjects were absolved from their allegiance, and all other engagements whatsoever. She is styled a usurper, and a vassal of iniquity, and is declared deprived of all her dominions†. All those who presumed to obey her commands were involved in the same

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 5. But Camden says that Westmoreland commanded a regiment belonging to the king of Spain.

† Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. b. 6. He has translated the bull as it stands in Sanders's book de Schismate Anglicano.

CHAP.  
XVII.

sentence of excommunication with herself, and all foreign potentates were encouraged to take up arms against her.

The bull was dispersed in England by the assiduity of Allen, the superior of the English college at Douay, but it was soon found that the thunders of the Vatican had lost much of their terror and all their destructiveness. Those princes of Europe who were in communion with the church of Rome, and in alliance with the ecclesiastical state, were not forward to avail themselves of the papal sanction for dethroning Elizabeth; and her popish subjects, after the suppression of the rebellions excited by the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, were quiet, if not obedient. The queen, notwithstanding the provocations which she had received from the Romish see, gave the Romanists a public assurance of her protection while their deportment was peaceable. It was "not her intention to press into the retirements of conscience," but all who lived in obedience to the laws should be equally entitled to their protection\*.

While the government was menaced by the court of Rome, the puritans improved the opportunity to widen their schism with the church, by raising new scruples against conformity, and bringing to perfection their new scheme of discipline. The polemical attack was conducted, not by a separatist, but by one who held an important station in the establishment. Thomas Cartwright, fellow of Trinity college, and Margaret professor in the university of Cambridge, is a name of too great cele-

\* Queen's declaration, published in the star-chamber. Collier's Eccles. Hist. Camden's Elizabeth.

brity in the annals of puritanism, to be dismissed without some observations on his early life. When queen Elizabeth honoured the university of Cambridge with a visit, Cartwright and Preston were selected to sustain the part of opponents in a philosophical disputation; but the superiority of Preston called from the queen decided marks of approbation, and of preference to his competitor. Cartwright could not dissemble his mortification, and from that time is dated his disaffection to the ecclesiastical constitution. That disgust at the distinctions bestowed on his opponent was the true cause of his hostility to the church is not improbable \*, but that his dislike of episcopacy incited him to travel to Geneva is certain. Having obtained an intimate knowledge of the Genevan discipline, having been personally acquainted with Beza†, and heard the invectives of the successor of Calvin against the English hierarchy, he returned to his native country and to the place of his education. The strength of the puritanical party was successfully exerted in electing him to the Margaret professorship, and he was thus enabled to promulge his opinions with authority. He animadverted in his lectures with great severity on the English hierarchy, and particularly against the following abuses: 1. The names and functions of archbishops and bishops ought to be suppressed, as

A. D.

1564.

Elizabeth.

1570.

\* Sir George Paul's *Life of Archbishop Whitgift*, in Wordsworth's *Eccles. Biog.* vol. iv. Collier's *Eccles. Hist.* vol. ii. b. 6. Strype's *Annals*, vol. i. folio.

† Beza said of Cartwright, "that, in his opinion, there was not a more learned divine under the sun." Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. c. 5.

CHAP.  
XVII.

having no foundation in Scripture. 2. The offices of the only lawful ministers of the church, bishops and deacons, ought to be reduced to the apostolical institution; the bishops to preach the word of God and to pray, and the deacons to take care of the poor. 3. The government of the church ought not to be intrusted to the chancellors of bishops, or the officials of archdeacons, but every church ought to be governed by its own minister and presbyters. 4. Ministers ought not to wander at large, but every one should take care of a certain flock. 5. No one should solicit for the ministerial function, or stand as a candidate for the ministry. 6. Bishops ought not to be created by civil authority, but to be fairly chosen by the church\*.

These propositions, boldly and authoritatively delivered by a man high in academical office, could not pass unnoticed. They were transmitted to Cecil, as chancellor of the university, who advised his vice-chancellor to silence their author, or to insist on a public recantation. To mitigate the resentment of Cecil, a testimonial in favour of Cartwright was signed by some distinguished names in the university, declaring that the subscribers had attended his lectures, and that he had never touched on the controversy of the habits; and though he had advanced some propositions with regard to the ministry, according to which he wished to see the ecclesiastical establishment modelled, yet he delivered himself with all imaginable caution and modesty. Cartwright also addressed Cecil in a Latin letter, in which he repeated the declaration

\* Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 5.

of the testimonial, that he had avoided to speak concerning the habits, but acknowledged that he had represented the English hierarchy as not framed after the apostolical model. Yet, even on this point, he had not delivered his sentiments with arrogance, as the whole university could testify. He prayed the chancellor to hear and judge the cause himself, but Cecil wisely referred the cause to the decision of the university. Cartwright was denied his grace for his doctor's degree, was then prohibited from reading as a public lecturer, was also deprived of his fellowship, and, finally, was expelled the university. Deprived of all ecclesiastical and academical offices, he again left England; and having been chosen pastor of a congregation, first at Antwerp, and then at Middleburgh, the church of England and the university of Cambridge were left in comparative tranquillity.

A. D.  
1570.  
Elizabeth.

To oppose this formidable antagonist of episcopacy, not by the strong arm of power, but by the fair weapons of controversy, Whitgift applied his early vigour, and Jewel devoted his last labours. Whitgift and Cartwright could not agree on the terms of a controversy, more than on the questions which divided them. The one declined a public disputation, unless he had a licence from the queen \*, and the other entirely refused a written discussion. But Whitgift, to check the doctrines of Cartwright, answered and refuted

\* "Because his assertions be repugnant to the state of the commonwealth, which may not be called into question by public disputation without licence of the prince." Act of the university of Cambridge, recorded in the registry book, dated March 18, 1570. Sir G. Paul's Life of Whitgift.

CHAP.  
XVII.

them in the same pulpit where they were delivered, and with such ability, that many were prevented from adopting the opinions of the champion of non-conformity. On his first return to England, and even after his elevation to the episcopal order, Jewel had expressed himself in strong terms against the use of the habits; but subsequent reflection, and an attentive observation of the evils of schism, had induced a change in his opinion. He saw that some were so eager in disputing on this matter, as if it comprised the whole substance and business of religion; he saw that many useful and pious ministers had left their stations and churches, rather than concede a point which, after all, was indifferent\*; he saw, likewise, that, although the habits were made a pretext for separation, yet they were not the real cause. It cannot therefore be wondered, that he was inclined to exact from others that obedience to the laws which he himself, after a serious and scrupulous deliberation, was prepared to yield. So tenacious was he of discipline, that he refused to his own chaplain, Humfreys, institution to a small benefice, given to him by the bishop of Winchester, solely on account of non-conformity to the prescribed habits. He wrote to the archbishop, that, in respect of the vain contention raised by Humfreys concerning apparel, he thought it best to wait till he had received the direction of the metropolitan, and that lenity and sufferance occasioned great disorders†.

1571.  
April 2.

The dangers which impended over the church

\* Jewel's Letter to Bullinger, dated February 26, 1567.

† Strype's Annals, vol. ii.

and kingdom, from the machinations of the papists and the puritans, determined Elizabeth to summon a parliament. The session was opened by the following impressive speech from the queen :  
 “ My right loving lords, and you, our right faithful and obedient subjects, we, in the name of God, for his service, and for the safety of the state, are now here assembled to his glory. I hope and pray that it may be to your comfort, and the common quiet of us, yours, and all ours, for ever\*.”

A. D.  
1571.

Elizabeth.

There was a spirit in the house of commons to attempt some legal relief for the puritans, and a bill was introduced for a farther reformation in the church, enforced by a speech† in disparagement of the liturgy. A second speech from the same member was answered by the treasurer of the household, who said, “ that all matters of ceremonies were to be referred to the queen, and that it was unbecoming in the commons to meddle with the royal prerogative.” But this reprehension not being sufficient, a message was sent to the committees of the lower house, purporting that “ she approved their good endeavours, but would not suffer these matters to be regulated by parliament‡.”

The temper of the commons probably impeded the parliamentary confirmation of the body of ecclesiastical laws drawn up in the reign of Edward the Sixth §. But the queen succeeded in procuring the enactment of several laws by which her pre-

\* D'Ewes's Journal, p. 137.

† From Mr. Strickland.

‡ D'Ewes's Journal, p. 185.

§ Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. b. 6.



CHAP. rogatives were strengthened. A statute was passed \*,  
XVII. making it high treason to call the queen a heretic,  
a schismatic, an infidel, or an usurper; to publish  
or put in use any bull of absolution, or reconciliation  
to the bishop of Rome. To conceal, or not  
to discover, offences of this kind, was made misprision of treason.

The convocation which sat with this parliament was opened by a sermon from Whitgift, who dilated on the dangers which threatened the church both from the papists and puritans. To secure the clergy from the errors of either, it was ordered, that such of the lower house of convocation as had not already subscribed the thirty-nine articles should subscribe without delay; and an unreasonable procrastination, as well as an absolute refusal, should be punished by expulsion from the house. It was farther ordered, that the book of articles, thus subscribed and approved, should be printed by the appointment and under the superintendence of the bishop of Salisbury†.

To secure the government from the papists on the one hand, and from the puritans on the other, a protestation was drawn up, to be taken by each of these parties. The papists were to profess that Elizabeth was the lawful queen of England, notwithstanding any act or sentence of the bishop of Rome; and the puritans were to make a similar profession, in opposition to any act or sentence of any church, synod, consistory, or ecclesiastical assembly.

The proceedings of the convocation were con-

\* Stat. 13 Elizabeth, c. 1.

† Jewel.

firmed by the authority of parliament, and were the foundation of an act "for reformation of disorders in the ministers of the church\*." It obliges the clergy to declare their assent to all the articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments; and enacts, that if any ecclesiastical person shall advisedly maintain any doctrine contrary to these articles, and shall refuse to retract his error, or, having retracted, shall relapse, he shall be deprived by the bishop of the diocese. All admissions to benefices, and all tolerations, dispensations, qualifications, and licences, contrary to the form and provision of the act, are declared void in law.

A. D.  
1571.

Elizabeth.

It cannot be denied that the penal statutes of this session were directed impartially against the papists and the puritans; but that their pressure was felt more severely by the latter must be attributed to the menacing attitude which the puritans at this time assumed. The activity and vigilance of Jewel were always seasonably applied, and in the last year of his life were directed against puritanical errors. His exertions were not confined to the convocation and the parliament; they were shown in his peculiar sphere, the pulpit. At the beginning of his episcopate, he had encountered the papists; at its close, he entered the lists with the puritans, on that theatre of polemical theology, Saint Paul's cross. His warfare with the papists had never been remitted, for in the preceding year he had engaged in the defence of the regal power against the fulminations of Pius the

\* Stat. 13 Elizabeth, c. 10.

CHAP.  
XVII.

Fifth\*. His controversy with the puritans, nothing but the danger which threatened the kingdom could have urged him to begin; but an awful sense of duty prevailed over every consideration of ease, popularity, or private friendship, because all were sacrificed. Nothing which came from the pen or fell from the lips of Jewel was without effect, and the deep sensation occasioned by his last sermon was thus alluded to by himself on his death-bed: "My last sermon at Saint Paul's, and the conference which I had with some of my brethren, concerning the present state of the church, was not undertaken to please any mortal man, or to exasperate or trouble those who thought otherwise than I did; but lest either party should prejudice the other, and that the love of God through the Holy Ghost, which is given to us, might be shed abroad in our hearts†." He subjoined his opinion, that these contentions were kindled and fomented by the popish party, and that many of the puritans were papists in disguise. The discernment of Jewel experience fully proved, and it was ascertained that the most popular preachers of the puritanical doctrines were popish priests‡. What Jewel thought of those who contemned discipline§ and violated

\* View of a Seditious Bull.

† Life of Jewel, prefixed to his Apology.

‡ As Coleman, Button, and Hallingham, and Thomas Heath, a jesuit, brother to the archbishop of York. For a proof of this fact, the reader is referred to Nelson's Collections, Preface to vol. i.; Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 521; Strype's Life of Parker; Maddox's Reply to Neal; and Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. b. 6.

§ The bishop said, "*Stultitia nata est in corde pueri, et virga disciplinæ fugabit illam.*"—Prov. c. 22, v. 15. Life of Jewel.

unity, under a pretence of purity and perfection, appears from the following passage in his sermon :

A. D.  
1571.

“ By what name shall I call you ? I would I might call you brethren ; but, alas ! this heart of yours is not brotherly. I would I might call you Christians ; but, alas ! you are no Christians. I know not by what name I shall call you ; for if you were brethren, you would love as brethren ; if you were Christians, you would agree as Christians.”

Elizabeth.

The puritans of his own time, and the historians of puritanism, have endeavoured to cast a shade over the lustre of his character, and have insinuated that there was a wide difference between Jewel as an exile, and as a prelate. His connexion with the court has been supposed to have rendered him the slave of arbitrary power, and the tool of regal prerogative. On no man could such imputations be charged with greater injustice than on Jewel. Preferment was not only unsought by him, but was forced on his acceptance ; and when thus reluctantly accepted, was not converted to the purposes of avarice or ambition, but was applied to edification and charity. He undertook with alacrity the most laborious duties of the pastoral function, and it was his common saying, that a bishop should die preaching. His own death was conformable to his maxim, for it was probably hastened by his zealous performance of this duty when oppressed by sickness.

Sept. 22.

Popish, as well as puritanical, calumny attempted to injure the memory of Jewel ; and it was reported, that at the hour of death he retracted his heresies, and returned to the catholic faith. The calumny was refuted by the testimony of an eye-

**CHAP.  
XVII.**

witness of his dying moments. Unto the end, he ceased not to continue in that belief which he had always professed, and his last words proved the sincerity of his faith and the fervency of his hope: "I have not so lived that I am ashamed to live, neither am I afraid to die."

The writer who has recorded the manner of his death has also subjoined an apostrophe, of which piety and taste equally forbid the suppression: "Be thou thankful to God for giving his church so worthy an instrument to his glory, and be careful to follow the good doctrine which he left behind him \*."

\* Garbrand's Preface to Jewel's View of a Seditious Bull.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

**Different Sects of the Puritans.—Their Influence in the Council, and in the House of Commons.—First Admonition to Parliament by Field and Wilcox.—Second Admonition to Parliament by Cartwright.—Whitgift's Controversy with Cartwright.—First Presbyterian Congregation at Wandsworth.—Puritans attempt to join the foreign Congregations.—Prophesyings of the Clergy.—Parker's Death.—Grindal's Succession.—Refuses to suppress the Prophesyings, and is suspended.—Parliament meets, and enacts penal Statutes against Papists and Puritans.—Further Dissensions.—Death of Grindal, and Succession of Whitgift.—Revives the Discipline of the Church.—Puritans propose their Scheme of Discipline in Parliament, but it is rejected.—Speech of the Queen at the Prorogation of Parliament.**

THE puritans, having now separated from the church, formed divisions among themselves, and were spread in different branches. A sect, denominated Precisians by Parker, held that obedience to civil government was a thing indifferent, and some of this sect attempted to gain possession of the royal chapel, and to preach the court sermons in Lent. Another branch of the puritans were the Brownists, who derived their name from Robert Brown. He was educated in the university of Cambridge, and being a contemporary of Cartwright, embraced his opinions, and at last went farther than Cartwright in dissent. He possessed nothing of Cartwright's moderation; but, in a strain of bitter satire, inveighed against the hierarchy as

A. D.  
1572.

---

Elizabeth.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

antichristian, and not better than the mission of the priests of Baal. He had frequently suffered imprisonment on account of his daring violation of the ecclesiastical laws; but his relationship to the secretary Cecil as frequently skreened him from punishment. At length, believing himself conscientiously obliged to go out of the church as another Babylon, he left his country, and joined the congregation of Cartwright at Middleburgh: but this communion not reaching his ideas of spiritual perfection, he refined on Cartwright's scheme, and became the founder of a sect. His notions of Christian purity were developed in a treatise on reformation, which he printed at Middleburgh, and sent into England, and having dispersed as many copies as he thought necessary, he resolved to carry his speculations into practice by his personal exertions, and return to his native land. In the latter part of a long life\*, he renounced his singularities, and accepted a benefice in the church; but his sect outlived the non-conformity of its founder, and was considered to be the most fanatical of all the modifications of puritanism.

1572.  
May 8.

At the council-board the puritans had many friends, of whom the earl of Leicester was chief, and in the house of commons their cause was strenuously defended by sir Peter Wentworth. The lord-keeper opened the succeeding session of parliament with a recommendation from the queen, that the laws relating to ecclesiastical discipline might be duly executed; but the commons, instead of framing any laws to enforce conformity, per-

\* He died in 1630.

mitted the introduction of two bills to mitigate the laws already enacted. These bills passed the commons without much opposition ; but their progress was arrested in the house of lords. The queen was so highly incensed, that she commanded the house of commons, through the speaker, never to entertain any bill concerning religion, unless it had been previously approved by the bishops and clergy in convocation, and further required that the two obnoxious bills should be resigned to her. This mandate called forth a spirited remonstrance from Wentworth. " It grieves me," he said, " to see in how many ways the liberty of free speech in parliament hath been infringed. Two things have lately prejudiced it: the one, a rumour which ran through the house, while the bill concerning rites and ceremonies was depending, that, if it passed, the queen would be offended; the other, a message brought to the house, either commanding or inhibiting our proceedings. It is dangerous," he added, " always to follow the inclinations of a prince, because the prince may favour a cause prejudicial to the honour of God and the good of the state. The queen has forbidden us to deal in any matter of religion, unless we first receive it from the bishops. This was a doleful message: there is then little hope of reformation. I have heard from old parliament-men, that the banishment of the pope, and the reforming true religion, had its beginning from this house, and not from the bishops. Few laws for religion have had their foundation with them, and I do surely think, before God I speak it, that the bishops were the cause of this doleful message." Such bold language, under the

A. D.

1572.

---

Elizabeth.



CHAP.  
XVIII.

reign of Elizabeth, was not to be uttered with impunity, even in the house of commons, and Wentworth was sent to the Tower.

In the mean time, the late act for subscribing the articles was carried into execution throughout England, and about one hundred clergymen were deprived for refusing to subscribe\*. The university of Cambridge was still a sanctuary for the puritans, and even the vigilance of Whitgift could not prevent them from showing a defiance of discipline. One Charke, a fellow of Peter-house, in a sermon before the university, maintained that there ought to be a parity of ministers in the church, and that the hierarchical orders were introduced into the church by Satan. Deering, a man of reputation for his preaching, both in the university and also at court, carried his invectives from prelacy to royalty†. Deprivation was inflicted on both these ministers; Charke by the authority of the university, and Deering by the court of high commission.

The puritans, finding that the queen and the bishops were resolved not to concede either to persuasion or menace, turned their attention to the parliament. They had interested many members of the house of commons in their favour, and, to strengthen this interest, set forth their grievances in a treatise, entitled "An Admonition to the Parliament," to which were annexed, Beza's letter to the earl of Leicester, and Gualter's letter to

\* Strype's Annals, vol. ii.

† In one of his sermons before the queen, he said, that when she was under persecution, her motto was, "*Tanquam ovis*;" but now it might be, "*Tanquam indomita juvenca*."—Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 5.

Parkhurst, bishop of Norwich. It contained the platform of a church, the manner of electing ministers, their several duties, and their equality in government\*. But it did not rest here: it inveighed with great severity against the corruptions of the hierarchy, and the late proceedings of the bishops. The admonition concluded with a petition to the house of commons, that a discipline might be established more consonant to the word of God, and to the practice of foreign churches. Its authors were two puritanical ministers, named Field and Wilcox†, and they had the courage to present the petition to the house: they might have anticipated the result, and it is scarcely necessary to add, that they were committed to prison.

A. D.  
1572.

Elizabeth.

Oct. 2.

The imprisonment of these two ministers occasioned a second admonition, by an author of greater notoriety: this was none other than Cartwright, who had returned to England not long before. The second admonition was expressed in the same style of petition, remonstrance, and invective as the first. It prayed relief against the subscription required by the ecclesiastical commissioners, a court which had no foundation in law, but was constituted by an act of sovereignty. "The matters," Cartwright observed, "contained in the first admonition, however true they may be, have found small favour; the persons who were its reputed authors have been

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 5.

† Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. b. 6, ascribes the first as well as the second admonition to Cartwright: but Neal, who was not likely to deprive Cartwright of any thing which he thought meritorious, ascribes the first admonition to Field and Wilcox.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

laid up in no worse a prison than that of Newgate, the men that set upon them were no worse than bishops, the name that goeth of them is no better than rebels, and great words there are that their danger will yet be greater. Whatsoever is said or done against them, that is not the matter, but the equity of the cause that is the matter; and yet this we will say, that the state sheweth itself not upright if it suffer them to be molested for that which was only spoken by way of admonition to parliament, which was to consider of it, and to receive or reject it, without farther matter to the authors, except it contained some wilful matter of treason or rebellion, which it was not proved to do\*.”

The prisoners themselves composed an apology in Latin, addressed to Cecil, now advanced to that title by which he is known to posterity, that of lord Burghley; but this application proving unsuccessful, after they had remained in confinement above a year, they petitioned the earl of Leicester and the lords of the council for their liberation. They also wrote a confession of their faith, with a preface, vindicating their conduct from the accusations of their enemies†.

The second admonition to parliament, as it was the production of Cartwright, and as it called forth an answer from Whitgift, demands a more enlarged notice. It was comprised in twenty-three chapters, comprehending all the matters of complaint which the puritans had unceasingly urged against the discipline of the church. As the puritans had set

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 5.

† Ibid.

forth their strongest arguments by their most able advocate, the bishops thought it incumbent to publish an answer bearing the stamp of authority. Whitgift was judiciously selected, and his answer was submitted to the perusal of Parker himself, of Cooper, then bishop of Lincoln, and of Pern, bishop of Ely. A performance thus finished with the greatest care, and revised by the most eminent prelates, was appropriately dedicated to the church of England. Its highest eulogy was bestowed, not by the friends, but by the enemies of that church, which Whitgift so ably defended. By them it was acknowledged, that the method was unexceptionable, the whole text of the admonition being inserted in paragraphs, and under each paragraph the answer; so that in this book might be seen all the arguments for and against the hierarchy displayed to the best advantage\*.

A. D.  
1572.

Elizabeth.

It was impossible that Whitgift and Cartwright should settle the controversy, because they differed on principles: Cartwright maintained that the holy Scriptures were not only a standard of religious doctrine, but of ecclesiastical discipline and civil government, and that the church of Christ, throughout all ages, ought to be governed by the rules of Scripture; all questions ought to be decided by the Bible alone: Whitgift held the contrary principle; that the Scriptures were a perfect rule of faith, but not of discipline; that the latter was changeable, and might be accommodated to the civil government; that the discipline prescribed by the apostles was suitable to the church in its infant

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i, c. 5.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

and persecuted state, but might properly be altered when the church was enlarged, and enjoyed the protection of the civil magistrate. "The reader will judge of these principles for himself," is the remark of the historian of puritanism; "and every man who will judge for himself," without prejudice, will determine on the side of Whitgift. If the holy Scriptures were designed as an unalterable model of discipline, it is impossible to avoid the doctrine of a community of goods, and civil government would be no better than an usurpation of the kingly government of Christ.

1573. Whitgift's answer provoked a reply from Cartwright, which was succeeded by a rejoinder on the part of Whitgift. In the last reply of Whitgift, he thus clearly stated the question at issue: "The question is not, whether many things mentioned in your platform of discipline were fitly used in the time of the apostles, or may now well be used in sundry reformed churches; this is not denied: but whether, when there is a settled order in doctrine and government established by law, it may stand with godly and Christian wisdom to attempt so great an alteration as this platform must needs bring in, with disobedience to the prince and the laws, and unquietness of the church, and offences of many consciences?"

There is no doubt that Cartwright had some admirers and more abettors; but his character and abilities were regarded with little estimation by an unexceptionable judge, because a zealous defender of Cartwright's doctrinal tenets. This was no other than Whitaker, who dissuaded Whitgift from attempting a second reply to his antagonist, because

it was needless to refute what had been already overthrown. But he brought a heavy accusation against the tendency of the puritanical doctrines\*: A. D.  
1573.  
Elizabeth.  
 “Of words, Cartwright has an easy flow, and a variety; but of matter he is entirely destitute. Besides this, not only his assertions are unsound concerning the authority of princes in sacred and ecclesiastical matters; but he is a deserter to the camp of the papists, from whom he would seem to fly with deadly hatred. He is intolerable, not only in this matter, but in other points he borrows his weapons from the papists†.”

Having thus failed in their attempts on the queen, the bishops, and the parliament, some of the puritans resolved to form a separate association. May 5.  
 For this purpose they erected a presbytery at Wandsworth, a village at a convenient distance from the city of London. Besides many of the ejected ministers, the association was joined by several laymen. Eleven elders were chosen, and their offices were described in a register, entitled “The Orders of Wandsworth.” This was the first presbyterian congregation established in England. All imaginable care was taken to keep their proceedings secret; but they could not elude the vigilance of the court of high commission. The queen issued a proclamation for enforcing the act of uniformity; but although the commissioners had

\* Life of Whitgift, by sir G. Paul.

† “The presbyterian party, notwithstanding their abhorrence of popery, agreed with the papists in one of their worst principles, the independency of the church upon the state. If they did not agree in words, they did in practice.”—Dr. T. Balguy’s Sermons, Disc. 15.

CHAP. XVIII. sufficient proof of the existence of this presbytery, yet they could never discover who were its members.

Nothing incensed the queen more justly against the puritans than their invasion of the supremacy, and their dogmata concerning civil government. She resolved, therefore, to direct the full force of the penal laws against these schismatics. Letters were sent from the lords of the council to the bishops, commanding them to enforce the laws, and to punish all recusants. The lord treasurer Burghley made a long speech before the commissioners in the star-chamber, in which he charged the bishops with neglect in putting the penal laws in execution. "The queen," he said, "thought none of her subjects entitled to protection who favoured innovation, or who countenanced the alteration of any thing established in the church. By improper lenity, some might be inclined to think that the exceptions of these novelists against the ceremonies of the church were reasonable and well-founded, or at least but trifling matters of dispute: but the queen was resolved that her orders and injunctions should not be contemned; that the public rule should be inviolably observed; and that there should be an absolute obedience, because the safety of government depended on it."

The leaders of the puritans being debarred the liberty of preaching and printing, challenged their adversaries to a public disputation: but the queen and the council would not permit the laws to be the subject of a syllogistic argument. Instead of a conference, the disputants were summoned before the court of high commission, to answer certain articles

alleged against them; but not answering to the satisfaction of the court, they were deprived.

A. D.  
1573.

Elizabeth.

There was yet a retreat, however limited and insecure, to which the puritans resorted. The French and Dutch congregations, which had been dispersed under the Marian persecution, were permitted to settle in England by Elizabeth. Attempts had been made to bring them under the jurisdiction, or at least the superintendence, of the bishop of the diocese where they were situated; but they pleaded their charter, which vested the choice of all their governors in themselves. Grindal, while bishop of London, exercised the office of superintendent; but it was by their free election and consent. Taking advantage, therefore, of these privileges, some of the English puritans gained admission into the foreign congregations: but, to prevent such abuse, an admonition was issued from the council to the ministers and elders of the Dutch congregation meeting in London. It contained an acknowledgment that, since the beginning of Christianity, different churches had differed in rites and ceremonies; that in their service and devotions some stood, others kneeled, and others lay prostrate, and yet the piety and religion of all were acceptable, if they directed their prayers to the true God. The English church contemned not the ceremonies of foreign churches; on the contrary, their ceremonies were worthy of approbation, as being suited to the nations where they were practised. But it was reasonable to expect that foreign churches should show the same deference to the church of England, and not commit any act which might bring on them a suspicion of wishing to dis-



CHAP.  
XVIII.

turb its peace. On this account it was expected that they should not receive into their communion any natives of England who might offer to join it; and a violation of this equitable regulation might induce the queen to dissolve their charter, and banish them from her dominions\*.

As the high commissioners had interposed, on a former occasion, to adjust the internal dissensions of the Dutch congregation at Norwich, the congregation at London was disposed to yield an implicit obedience to their present admonition. A due acknowledgment was returned by the foreign church for the liberty and protection which it enjoyed, with a promise to expel any native of England who might attempt to join its communion†.

The last refuge which the puritans sought, and which, unlike the former, afforded safety, was one by which they were defended by law. They formed associations, distinguished by the name of prophesyings of the clergy. The clergy were divided into classes, under a moderator appointed by the bishop of the diocese; their meetings were held twice in a month; a sermon was preached, at which the people were allowed to be present, and, after the people were dismissed, the members of the association criticised the performance of the preacher‡.

In some dioceses these prophesyings were countenanced, and even sanctioned, by the bishops;

\* Strype's Life of Parker.

† Strype's Annals, vol. ii.

‡ Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 5.

but by Parker they were considered only as seminaries of puritanism; and by this unfavourable representation to the queen, the archbishop received private instructions to suppress them. The last years of Parker's life were employed in this ungrateful and invidious work, and were embittered by contentions with those prelates who favoured the prophesyings. He was so intimately acquainted with the spirit and tendency of puritanism, that he foretold its fatal effects, and predicted that the mischief would extend beyond the ruin of the hierarchy\*. In one of his latest communications with his friend Burghley, he lamented the ascendancy which this sect was imperceptibly gaining in the favour of the queen, and in the administration of the government, and that the event must be the overthrow of the monarchy. He complained of the inconstancy of some of the bishops, who either gave him no assistance, or endeavoured to counteract his exertions to preserve discipline†. He was not so much concerned for the observance of ceremonies, as for that of the laws which enjoined these ceremonies; and added that, if public provisions were once disregarded and treated with contempt, the government must fall. As for the

A. D.

1575.

Elizabeth.

\* “ Parker, in July, 1573, told lord Burghley, that however some of the nobility were of the puritans, and countenanced them against the bishops, they themselves might rue it at last: and that all that these men tended towards was to the overthrow of all honourable society, and the setting afloat a commonwealth, or, as he called it, a singularity.”—*Strype's Life of Parker*, b. iv. c. 33.

† Fuller calls him a Parker indeed, careful to keep the fences, and shut the gates of discipline.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

queen's ecclesiastical prerogative, though he feared that it was not so great as Burghley had stated in the royal injunctions, yet it was more extensive than the papists would allow.

May 17. The death of Parker was a calamity to the church, which could not be repaired easily; but the calamity was incalculably increased by the appointment of Grindal to the vacant primacy: it was an undeniable proof of the ascendancy which Parker foresaw. Grindal was a prelate of excellent intentions, but without consistency or vigour. His imbecility of temper, rather than moderation of principle, occasioned a partial and therefore a mischievous relaxation of the laws; and possessing no weight in the council, he was unable to restrain the capricious severity of the government.

1577. Those prophesyings, which Parker had laboured with so much earnestness to suppress, Grindal exerted himself to regulate. It could not be denied that they were frequently attended with evil; that erroneous doctrines were propagated by them; and that they were promoted by such ministers as had been deprived for contempt of discipline. Grindal thought that these evils were accidental, and not essential to the prophesyings, and therefore framed a body of laws to prevent their abuses. They had already acquired importance and stability by a code of regulations, drawn up by Cartwright and Travers with great art and ability, being designed to introduce a complete revolution in the church, instead of a separation\*. Every rule was moulded into an apparent consistency with episcopal government,

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 6.

while it was really subversive of the ecclesiastical polity. Every one of their ministers was obliged to receive episcopal ordination; and though they maintained the choice of the people to be the essential call to the pastoral charge, yet they also maintained that institution and induction into a benefice were vested in the bishop only; but their recognition of these episcopal rights was, that the minister thus appointed might be enabled to demand his legal dues from the parish\*.

A. D.  
1577.  
Elizabeth.

Injudicious, therefore, was the attempt of Grindal to reform associations radically vicious, and to skreen them from the animadversion and hostility of the government. His injunctions, that the ministers in these meetings should refrain from meddling with civil affairs, and that laymen or non-conformists should be prohibited from speaking, only proved the purity of his own views, and decidedly proved the unsoundness of his judgment.

The queen, with superior discrimination to the archbishop, saw the tendency of these associations, and determined to suppress them. In a personal interview with several of the prelates, she stated that, according to information on which she could rely with confidence, the rites and ceremonies of the church were not observed at the prophesyings; that persons not lawfully ordained officiated; and that the assemblies were in themselves illegal, not being allowed by her authority. The laity neglected their secular affairs by resorting to such assemblies, and they were calculated to raise seditions in the state, as well as schisms in the church. It was,

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 6.

---

**CHAP.  
XVIII.**

therefore, her determination, that the prelates should abolish the prophesyings, and permit "no manner of divine service" to be performed but that which was established by law: whenever the ministers were not sufficiently learned to preach, they were commanded to read the homilies.

Most of the bishops yielded a prompt obedience to the royal injunction, and suppressed the prophesyings within their respective diocesses; but some did it with declared reluctance, and only till they could, "by earnest prayer or humble petition," obtain the queen's licence again to use these edifying exercises. Grindal alone had the courage to remonstrate, and though he had hitherto implicitly yielded to the will of his sovereign, in this instance he ventured to disobey, and to express his disobedience in no very courtly language. Instead of directing his archdeacons to carry into execution the injunction of the queen, he wrote a long and earnest letter. Its principal topics were the necessity and usefulness of public preaching, and the subserviency of the prophesyings to the instruction of the people. With respect to preaching, it was one of the ordinary means of salvation, and they were taught by it piety to God and obedience to their civil governors. To read the homilies might be useful; yet they were not to be compared to preaching, which might be suited to the diversity of times, places, and hearers, and be delivered with more efficacy and affection. Homilies were devised only to supply the want of preachers, and, by the statute which first enjoined their use, were to give place to sermons whenever they could be procured. As to the exercises, he apprehended that they

Dec. 10.

were profitable to the church, and, in saying this, he expressed not only his own sentiments, but those of many prelates. Several bishops had signified that, by means of these exercises, the clergy were better versed in the Scriptures than formerly; study and diligence were promoted, and they were a powerful antidote against popery. He denied that such meetings were illegal; for, by the constitutions and canons of the church then in force, every bishop had authority to appoint such exercises at his discretion. Towards the close of the letter the archbishop took higher ground: he professed his willingness to resign his province, if it should be the queen's pleasure: but he ventured to offer two requests: first, that the queen would refer all ecclesiastical matters to the bishops and divines of the realm, according to the practice of the first Christian emperors: secondly, that, when she handled matters of faith and religion, she would not pronounce so peremptorily as in civil matters, but would remember that, in God's cause, his will, and not the will of any earthly creature, is to take place. He reminded her that, though she was a great and mighty princess, yet she was mortal, and accountable to God; and that, for himself, he could not, without offence of the divine Majesty, send forth injunctions for the suppression of those exercises\*.

The queen was highly incensed by this letter, and resolved to punish the chief governor of the church, as the best method to strike terror into the rest of the prelacy, and secure compliance with her injunctions. By an order from the star-chamber,

A. D.  
1576.

Elizabeth.

1577.  
June.

\* Collier's Eccles. Hist. vol. ii. b. 6.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Dec. 29.

Grindal was confined to his house, and sequestered from his archiepiscopal jurisdiction for six months; and, to render the punishment more severe, the sequestration was imposed as he was proceeding with his metropolitical visitation\*. Before the expiration of the term assigned for his suspension, he was advised to make his submission. He complied so far as to acknowledge the clemency of the queen, and to promise future obedience; but he could not be persuaded to retract his former opinion, or to confess sorrow for his past conduct. The imperfect submission of Grindal was deemed insufficient, his sequestration was continued till about a year before his death, and he never recovered the favour of his sovereign.

1581.  
Jan. 10.

It was now that the house of commons began to assert its independence of the other estates of the realm, and to assume the liberty of complaint and remonstrance. In the session of parliament which followed the suppression of the prophesyings, the commons voted that as many of their members as could conveniently attend should assemble at the Temple church, there to have preaching, and to join together in prayer, with humiliation and fasting, for the assistance of the Holy Spirit in all their consultations, and for the preservation of the queen and her dominions†. The house adopted the cautious resolution of referring the choice of the preachers to such of its members as were of the privy council. Though there was nothing in this vote contrary to law, yet the queen was no sooner advertised of it, than she sent sir Christopher

\* Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. b. 6.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 6.

Hatton, her vice-chamberlain, to express her surprise and displeasure "at the rashness of the commons, in putting into execution such an innovation, without her pleasure being first made known to them." On receiving this message, the court party had sufficient influence to cause the vote to be rescinded, and the house was also prevailed on to acknowledge its offence, and to promise that it should not be repeated.

A. D.  
1581.  

---

Elizabeth.

Parliament being thus prohibited from appointing times of fasting and prayer, a similar injunction was given to the clergy. Some of them, even after the suppression of the prophesyings, had ventured to agree on days of private fasting and prayer for the queen and the church, and of exhorting the people to repentance and reformation of life. All the puritans who remained within the church observed these days of private appointment; but the queen, on receiving intimation that such unauthorized meetings were continued, determined on their suppression, as being contrary to her prerogative \*. Information having been also given that some who had benefices, and who preached weekly, neglected to administer the holy communion in their own persons, the queen commanded the bishops to inquire respecting such half-conformists as disjoined one part of their duty from the other, and to compel them, by ecclesiastical censures, to perform the whole at least twice in every year. The puritanical ministers being dissatisfied with the promiscuous access of all persons to the communion, and with several passages in the communion-service, were sometimes induced to provide a qualified

\* Heylin's *Aerius Redivivus*, p. 286.



CHAP.  
XVIII.

minister, who had not their scruples, to officiate in their room. This reprehensible practice was now disallowed, and those ministers, who would not discontinue it after admonition, were subject to deprivation.

The disaffection of the puritans to the ecclesiastical government was no longer confined within the bounds of fair aggression, but vented itself in satirical and scurrilous pamphlets. Conscientious dissent will always command forbearance, when it operates as an impediment to temporal advancement: it commands more than forbearance, it compels veneration, when it leads to positive suffering or privation. But dissent, however sincere, or however well-founded, loses its respectable character when provoked by persecution into bitterness of temper or extravagance of opinion. The pamphlets of the puritans were equally deficient in decency of language and strength of argument. The unpreaching clergy were called, in scriptural language, "dumb dogs," because they took no pains for the instruction of their parishioners. The authors glanced at the severity of the laws, at the pride and ambition of the bishops, at the illegal proceedings of the high commission, and at the unjustifiable rigour of the court.

These proceedings gave rise to a statute providing a punishment far too severe for the offence\*. It was enacted that, if any person or persons, after forty days from the expiration of the session, should print or publish any writing or book, tending to the defamation of the queen's majesty, or to the

\* St. 23 Eliz. c. 2.

encouragement of any insurrection or rebellion, the offender, on conviction, should suffer death and loss of goods, as in cases of felony. This statute was to continue in force only during the life of the then queen; but within that space many puritans suffered death for its transgression\*.

A. D.  
1581.  
Elizabeth.

In the same session of parliament another law was made, which was levelled both against the puritans and papists†. It was entitled "An act to restrain the queen's subjects within their due obedience." By this statute it was made treason for any priest or jesuit to seduce any of the queen's subjects from the established to the Romish religion; to be reconciled to the see of Rome was high treason; and to harbour any such offender above twenty days was misprision of treason. If any one was convicted of saying mass, he was to forfeit one hundred marks, and suffer a year's imprisonment. But that the act might comprehend other non-conformists besides the papists, it was further enacted, that all persons who did not come to church or chapel, or other place where common prayer was said, according to the act of uniformity, were to forfeit twenty pounds every month, and to suffer imprisonment until the fine was paid. Those who voluntarily absented themselves for twelve months, on certificate of their default being made in the court of queen's bench, besides the common fine, were obliged to find sureties for their future good behaviour. Every schoolmaster who neglected to attend divine service, or who kept

\* Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 6.

† St. 23 Elizabeth, c. 3.

**CHAP.  
XVIII.**

school without a licence from the bishop of the diocess, was liable to a penalty of ten pounds monthly, and was to suffer a year's imprisonment.

These measures were undoubtedly arbitrary and unjust, however great might be the provocations under which they were enacted. Men who act either from passion, prejudice, or principle, are equally impenetrable by penal laws; and the puritans, who were severally actuated by all these motives, were driven farther from conformity.

Next to the purity of her doctrines, and the vigilance of the civil government, the church found her best security in the dissensions of her enemies. Not only the puritans and the papists attacked each other with fury, and mutually complained of the partiality of the queen towards their adversaries, but the puritanical sects displayed the greatest virulence towards each other. The most fanatical branch of the puritans, the Brownists, not only renounced all communion with the church in prayers and ceremonies, but in hearing the word, and in a participation of the sacraments. The family of love, or the house of charity, a sect which had its origin in Holland \*, were, if possible, still higher enthusiasts than the Brownists: they held that election was confined to themselves, and that the rest of mankind were doomed to damnation; they also asserted the privilege of denying any thing which they pleased on oath, before a magistrate, or any other person of a different religion. The extravagancies of these sects the sober-minded puritans disclaimed, and reprobated with

\* Its founder was Henry Nicholas, a Dutchman.

scrimony; and dissensions ensued, as fierce and implacable as those which they entertained against the object of their common enmity, the church of England.

A. D.  
1581.  
Elizabeth.

Though the queen and the bishops succeeded in excluding the puritans from all public ministration and preaching, yet they were still received by the nobility and higher classes into their houses as chaplains or tutors: there they were permitted to expound the Scriptures, and to catechise youth. The task of education in a great degree devolved on them, and therefore it is not surprising that puritanical tenets gained a strong hold on the minds of the rising generation.

While the puritans were thus silently sowing that seed which was hereafter to spring into a prolific crop, the papists were not inactive. The English colleges at Douay and Rome sent over a swarm of jesuits, who disseminated their devotional and controversial treatises, and employed with success the arts of proselytism. They had private conventicles in almost every town; and in the northern counties their numbers exceeded the protestants. As a marriage was at this time contemplated between Elizabeth and the duke of Anjou, alarms had been industriously spread that a toleration, if not an establishment, of the Romish religion would follow. To silence these reports, the queen consented, after much importunity, to execute the penal laws against the papists, and several priests and jesuits were apprehended. *Campion*, a jesuit of great learning, with two other Romish priests \*, were indicted for high treason,

Dec. 1.

\* *Ralph Sherwin* and *Alexander Bryant*.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

---

and their conduct on their trial is a demonstration that their condemnation and subsequent execution was not an act of wanton cruelty, but of necessary precaution. The declaration of the queen was strictly true, that she was averse from punishing her Romish subjects for the sake of conscience; but when religion was made a cloak of conspiracy and treason, then she was compelled to strike\*.

It was therefore without reason that the puritans raised an outcry against the queen and her government, because the Romish religion was treated with undue indulgence, and even secretly encouraged, while the puritans were sought after with jealous vigilance; for indiscriminate severity was exercised against both†. Yet such was the popular accusation; and it was set forth in glowing colours, in a supplication from the magistrates of Suffolk to the privy council: "The painful ministers of God's word are marshalled with the worst malefactors, presented, indicted, arraigned, and condemned, for matters, as we presume, of very slender moment. A most pitiable thing it is to see the back of the law turned to the adversary, and the edge with all sharpness laid upon the true-hearted subject." But in the petition for liberty of conscience, in which this grave accusation is contained, there was another passage, which proved that the petitioners confined this liberty within very circumscribed limits, or, in other words, to themselves: "We serve the queen and the country

\* Camden's Elizabeth.

† "Were the jesuits more faulty in setting the laws at defiance than the puritans? I think not." Bishop Warburton's Remarks on Neal's History of the Puritans.

according to law; we reverence the law, and the law-maker: when the law speaks, we keep silence; when it commands, we obey. By law we proceed against all offenders; we touch none that the law spares, and spare none that the law touches. We allow not the papists, their subtilties and hypocrisies; we allow not the family of love, an egg of the same nest; we allow not the anabaptists and their communion; we allow not of Brown, the overthrower of church and commonwealth: we abhor all these; no, we punish all these\*." Men of this description are never at a loss for a reason why other sects should be persecuted, and their own protected, and the petitioners drew the line of distinction in the following manner: "We are christened with the odious name of puritans; a term compounded of the above-mentioned heresies, which we disclaim. The papists pretend to be pure and immaculate; the family of love cannot sin, they being deified, as they say, of God. But we groan under the burden of our sins, and confess them to God; and at the same time we labour to keep ourselves and our profession unblamable. This is our puritanism."

A. D.

1583.

Elizabeth.

While Grindal lived, the springs of ecclesiastical discipline moved but heavily †. He had recovered the favour of Elizabeth so far as to be restored to his archiepiscopal functions; but a loss of sight and general infirmity disabled him from their exercise. A resignation of his dignity was, therefore, proposed and accepted; but death interposed before the instrument was executed. Of his character it

1583.

\* Strype's Annals, vol. iii. p. 183. 4.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

Sept. 23.

is enough to say, that he has been immortalized by Spenser \*.

Whitgift, already promoted to the see of Worcester, had long been designated for the primacy, and, on the death of Grindal, was soon confirmed in this high office. Having distinguished himself by his controversy with the puritans, he was selected by the queen to bring them to conformity. On his advancement she charged him to restore the discipline of the church, which, "through the connivance of some prelates, the obstinacy of the puritans, and the power of some noblemen, was run out of square †." Whitgift obeyed the injunction with alacrity, and within the first week after his elevation, he enforced subscription to three articles as the pre-requisite for admission into the church. These articles were: 1. The ecclesiastical supremacy of the sovereign; 2. The lawfulness of the common prayer and ordinal; 3. The conformity of the thirty-nine articles to the word of God ‡.

This injunction of the new archbishop was not published without raising a dispute concerning its legality. Some civil lawyers were of opinion that the archbishop had no authority to impose any

\* Grindal is Spenser's *Algrind*, this word being an anagram of his name. The poet thus alludes to his loss of regal favour:

"Thom. But say mee, what is *Algrind*, hee  
That is so oft bynempt?

Mor. He is a shepherd great in gree,  
But hath been long ypent."

*Shepherd's Calendar, Eccl. 7.*

† Strype's *Life of Whitgift*.

‡ Subscription to these articles was afterwards required by the canons of 1603, canon 36.

articles, except under the great seal, and that his present proceeding was an abuse of the royal prerogative, a violation of the law, and, consequently, an act of oppression on the subject. But it was answered, in defence of Whitgift, that, by the canon law, a metropolitan has a right to make regulations for the government of his province, provided they do not militate against the peace of the realm : it was also answered, that the queen, as head of the church, had a right to publish articles and injunctions for bringing the clergy to uniformity ; and that the archbishop, in the present case, had acted by the queen's direction.

A. D.  
1584.  

---

Elizabeth.

The objections were not thought of sufficient weight to alter Whitgift's conduct ; for, in his primary visitation, he insisted peremptorily, not only that those who were admitted to any benefice, but that those who were in possession, should subscribe the three articles. The second, he well knew, the puritans would refuse ; and many of the puritanical clergy were deprived. The persevering courage of Whitgift, supported by the queen, enabled him to resist the strong opposition by which he was encountered. Leicester and Walsingham cordially espoused the cause of the puritans, and even Burghley appeared to regard their contempt of discipline with an imperturbable complacence. The archbishop being inflexible in refusing any abatement of discipline, Burghley proposed to the dissenters that, since they could not conscientiously use the established liturgy, they should frame another. This overture was joyfully accepted : a committee of puritans sketched out a form nearly resembling the service-book of Geneva ; the out-



CHAP.  
XVIII.

line was then submitted to a second class, who offered six hundred exceptions to it; a third class disliked the exceptions of the second, and declared for an entirely new model; a fourth class made still further refinements. When Burghley saw that they could not fix on any form of divine service, he assured the agents for the puritans that, whenever they came to any unanimous resolution, they might expect his assistance in bringing their scheme to a settlement\*.

December.

That the puritans might have no reasonable complaint, Whitgift consented to hold a conference with some of their disaffected ministers. The archbishop associated with himself Cooper, bishop of Winchester, to answer the objections of Sparke and Travers against the book of common prayer. A conference took place on the subject at Lambeth, in the presence of the earl of Leicester, lord Grey, and sir Francis Walsingham. With the greatest urbanity, the archbishop encouraged these two dissidents to state their grievances, not as being judicially summoned for disobedience to established ordinances, but as voluntarily met for the purpose of a fair and friendly discussion. Instead of proceeding directly to the subject, Sparke replied, that as the good issue of the conference depended upon the favour of God, he desired, before they entered on the argument, to seek the gracious direction and blessing of God by prayer. And with this request, placing himself in a suitable posture, he was about to pray, when the archbishop interrupted him, saying, that he should

\* Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. b. 7.

make no prayers there, nor turn the room into a conventicle. Travers joined with Sparke in requesting licence to pray; but the earl of Leicester requested them to desist, since there was no doubt that they had said their prayers before they came thither. Sparke complied so far as to omit the long prayer which he had originally intended to use, but persevered in offering a short address to God, throughout which he was continually interrupted by the archbishop\*.

A. D.  
1584,  
Elizabeth.

The conference was resumed on a second day, and it terminated in the dissatisfaction of both parties. The puritanical ministers were not convinced, and the archbishop was confirmed in his resolution of enforcing conformity. But the noble men who were present at the conference were constrained to acknowledge, that they could not otherwise have believed the reasoning of the archbishop to be so strong, and the objections of his opponents to be so weak and trivial†.

In the same proportion as the puritans were discomfited by legitimate argument, their virulence increased. There was a book in high repute among them, entitled "The Holy Discipline of the Church, described in the Word of God." This treatise was originally written in Latin by Travers; but it had been submitted to the revisal of Cartwright, and by him had been translated into

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 7.

† Life of Whitgift by sir Geo. Paul. Strype, in his Life of Whitgift, says, that the puritanical ministers were convinced by this conference: but this assertion is justly questioned by Neal, because Travers continued a non-conformist to his death, and Sparke appeared at the Hampton-court conference on the side of the dissenters.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

English. It contained the substance of those alterations in discipline for which the puritans contended; it was the standard to which they appealed, and which they aimed at establishing by the intervention of the civil power.

The puritans, having experienced in a former parliament the favourable disposition of the house of commons, prosecuted their design of effecting a reformation through that body. Their agents were employed in soliciting the members even at the doors of the house, and when the house was risen, in renewing their importunities at the habitations of different individuals. Soon after the commencement of the session, three petitions were offered to the house in favour of the dissenters. A motion was also made, that the book of discipline should be read, with a view to its enactment; but the motion being opposed by sir Francis Knolles, seconded by sir Christopher Hatton, the book was not suffered to be read\*. The petitions were reduced into sixteen articles, and presented by the commons to the house of lords; but the opinion of the lords was delivered briefly by the lord treasurer, and at great length by the archbishop of York, against any further discussion of such matters. Burghley stated that, in the judgment of the house, many of the articles were unnecessary, for others provision was already made, and that uniformity in divine service was already settled by parliament.

1585.  
Feb. 25.

It was not thought sufficient by the prelates to reject these articles in the house of lords; for Cooper, bishop of Winchester, refuted them in a

\* D'Ewes's Journal.

treatise. The five first articles, he observed, related to the insufficiency of ministers, and the reformation of an unlearned ministry: yet, though there might be some instances of incompetence, there never was less reason for complaint; and there was still a progress towards improvement. The sixth article demanded that all pastors might be tried and approved by their respective parishes: but such a mode of appointment had long since been abrogated as pernicious in itself, and as being an infringement of the rights of patronage. The five succeeding articles complained of the oath and subscription required by the archbishop, of ecclesiastical censures, and of the abuses of the high commission court: but if these demands were granted, the hierarchy and the civil government would be overthrown. The twelfth article proposed the establishment of exercises and conferences, under the control of the ordinary: but these services had been already tried, and for good reasons had been suppressed. The two next articles related to excommunication; which, it was contended, ought not to be pronounced for light offences, and not by laymen: these evils, it was candidly acknowledged, ought to be redressed. The last articles regarded pluralities and non-residence: but these were defended on account of the small value of many ecclesiastical benefices.

A. D.  
1585.

Elizabeth.

So powerful, however, was the interest of the dissenters in the house of commons, that a bill was introduced for the regulation of pluralities, the correction of non-residence, and for appeals against ecclesiastical courts. This interference in ecclesiastical discipline attracted the attention of Whit-

CHAP.  
XVIII.

gift : he drew up his reasons against the bill, and prevailed with the convocation to present them to the queen in the form of an address. The bill was represented to be an invasion of the royal prerogative ; and while it lessened the revenues of the crown, infringed the rights of private patronage. Of its consequences it was predicted, that such a statute would be a prejudice to learning, would introduce a base and unlearned clergy, and would be an encouragement to students to go to foreign universities, where they might obtain a better provision ; and, in a word, would make way for anarchy and confusion\*. But to show that the convocation was not indisposed to redress fair and just grievances, six articles, relating principally to the abuses of ecclesiastical courts, were presented to the queen as the sum of necessary reformation.

While the convocation was thus employed, the bill against pluralities passed the house of commons, and was sent up to the lords. There the archbishops of Canterbury and York, with the bishop of Winchester, opposed the bill with the same energy as in convocation. They argued, that neither the universities nor cathedrals could subsist without pluralities ; and, to prove their assertion, a list of ecclesiastical livings was produced, whose revenues were utterly insufficient for the support of a resident incumbent. The weight of the bishops being joined with that of the court, the bill was rejected.

The commons were so highly exasperated by this failure that they ordered several other bills

\* Life of Whitgift, and Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 7.

to be introduced subversive of episcopacy. One was for imposing an oath on all bishops, to be taken in the court of chancery or queen's bench, not to do any act contrary to the laws of the land. Another bill was aimed at the reduction of fees; a third was for liberty to marry at all times of the year; a fourth, for the qualification of ministers; and a fifth, for the restoration of discipline. The bill for the qualification of ministers annulled all popish ordinations, and disqualified all who were incapable of preaching, as well as all who were convicted of profaneness or immorality. It insisted on an examination of candidates for the ministry by the bishop, assisted by twelve laymen, and made the consent, if not the election, of the people necessary to induction into any pastoral charge. The bill for the restoration of discipline went to abolish the canon law and all spiritual courts, and to bring all testamentary and matrimonial causes into Westminster-hall. It proposed to constitute a presbytery or eldership in every parish, which was to determine the spiritual causes arising within its district, with a reservation of appeal to higher judicatories.

A. D.  
1585.  
Elizabeth.

When the bill for the qualification of ministers had passed the house of commons, Whitgift thought it incumbent on him to interpose, and to stay its progress by a remonstrance to the queen. He therefore wrote an earnest address, reminding her that the discussion of ecclesiastical matters in the lower house, without her permission, had been already prohibited, and was now carried on in defiance of her injunctions. The bill which the commons had just passed was equally repugnant to

CHAP. sound reason and ecclesiastical discipline; and this  
XVIII. bill was only a prelude to others tending to overthrow the constitution\*.

This letter either found or made the queen of the same opinion with its author, and the advice of Whitgift was seldom urged in vain. A message from the throne was immediately sent to the house of commons, severely reprehending them "for attempting what she had forbidden." The speaker was commanded to see that no bills touching reformation in causes ecclesiastical should be exhibited, and if any such were exhibited, she commanded him on his allegiance not to suffer them to be read.

March 29. The queen in her speech to the two houses, at the prorogation of parliament, adverted to the late proceedings. She noticed the disposition of some persons to blame the clergy; but added, that a censure of this kind reflected on herself. Since God had made her an over-ruler of the church, her negligence could not be excused if any schism or heresy was encouraged. She granted that there might be some misconduct or negligence in the clergy, but that such errors or lapses were common to all. "Yet," continued the queen, addressing herself to the assembled prelates, "if you, my lords of the clergy, do not amend, I mean to depose you. Look you, therefore, well to your charges†."

\* Fuller's Church Hist. b. 9.

† D'Ewes's Journal.

## CHAPTER XIX.

Application of the Puritans to the Convocation and to Whitgift, for Relief.—Dangers to the Government.—Spanish Armada.—Conduct of the Papists and Puritans.—Martin Marprelate.—Answers by Bridges and Cooper.—New Parliament.—Severe penal Laws passed.—Of the Barrowists, and the Execution of their Leaders.—Penry's Character and Death.—Writings of the English Divines against Puritanism.—HOOKER'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

WHILE the puritans were urging their solicitations on the house of commons, they did not neglect to bring their grievances before the convocation. An address was presented in the name of those ministers who had refused to subscribe the three articles promulgated by the archbishop. These ministers desired at least to be satisfied with respect to their scruples, a satisfaction which had not hitherto been attempted\*. The convocation having rejected their petition, the ministers printed their "Apology to the Church, and Humble Suit to the High Court of Parliament." In this performance they repeated the common objections against the liturgy, and concluded with an earnest request that they might be continued in their cures. As they had been set apart to the sacred ministry, they considered themselves to be bounden to God and their flocks; they professed their readiness to submit to any ordinance which was

A. D.  
1585.

---

Elizabeth.

\* Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 7.



CHAP. not sinful, because they apprehended that the  
XIX. "shepherds being stricken, their flocks would be  
scattered \*."

After these fruitless solicitations to the parliament and the convocation, the puritans importuned the archbishop separately to exert his interest with the queen for an abatement in the terms of conformity. A short tract was also published, containing "Means to settle a godly and charitable Quietness in the Church," humbly addressed to the primate. Whitgift never spared any personal exertion when he could be useful, and his living cares as his dying wishes were for the church of God. With great assiduity and skill he framed an answer to the treatise, in which he informed the petitioners, that it was not his business to alter or to dispense with the ecclesiastical laws, but to see that they were duly observed. On one of the propositions submitted by the non-conforming ministers, he commented with his usual acuteness. It was proposed that those ministers who had been suspended for their refusal to subscribe the articles might be restored to their benefices, on condition of giving a bond or security not to preach against the hierarchy, or to disturb the peace of the church; but, on the contrary, to uphold both, as far as they consistently and conscientiously were able. To this proposal, specious but hollow, Whitgift replied, that he was not averse from receiving such a bond; but added the following unanswerable observation: "He that shall enter into a bond, and yet refuse

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 7.

to subscribe, is in my opinion very hypocritical or very perverse; for a bond is a stronger assurance than subscription\*.”

A. D.  
1585.

---

Elizabeth.

These divisions, as it was reasonable to expect, were converted by the papists to their advantage, and a plot was at this time formed for the assassination of the queen. The principal contriver of the conspiracy was lord Paget, who escaped by flight as soon as his treason was discovered; while one Parry, who was to have been the instrument of this treason, was executed†.

The parliament which met after the discovery of this conspiracy, sensible of the calamities which must happen to the nation by the death of the queen, entered into a voluntary association to revenge it, if it should take place by violence. They also enacted a severe statute against jesuits and priests of foreign seminaries, or any others who should engage in plots, by virtue of the bull of excommunication of pope Pius the Fifth, and against any English subject who should go to the foreign popish seminaries for education.

1586.  
Nov. 15.

The trial and execution of the unfortunate queen of Scotland, have thrown a shade over the character of Elizabeth which it is impossible to dispel, and even her vindicators have been constrained to acknowledge that her conduct had in it more of policy than justice, and more of spleen than policy. The impartial judgment of Camden has attributed this tragical catastrophe to the excessive anxiety of the protestants for the safety of Elizabeth, as it

1587.  
Feb. 8.

\* Bishop Maddox's Vindication against Neal, p 348.

† Strype's Annals, vol. ii. folio edition.

CHAP.  
XIX.

was connected with their religion, and to the intrigues of the papists, eager to reduce England under the jurisdiction of the see of Rome. Mary was the last hope of the Romanists, and their extinction of hope was succeeded, not by despondency, but by rebellion.

The parliament did not separate without another effort on the part of the puritans to obtain relief, or more properly an establishment\*. The house of commons also, not intimidated by its former defeat, revived the bill for farther reformation. A new book of common prayer was proposed for the sanction of parliamentary authority; and the reformed liturgy, while it contained a prescribed form to be used before and after the sermon, left to the officiating minister the liberty of varying it according to his discretion. The article in the creed on the descent of Christ into hell was altered, and three out of the thirty-nine articles established by Elizabeth were omitted. Besides the change in the liturgy, the bill provided for the total abolition of the ecclesiastical courts: the spiritual jurisdiction was to be placed in the hands of an assembly of ministers and elders in every county, which assembly was empowered to examine, approve, and present ministers to the several parishes for their sanction, and were to depose them, with consent of the bishop, for misconduct†.

Some bold speeches were made in the house against the proceedings of the bishops, and particularly by Wentworth, who, unmindful of his

\* Bishop Warburton's Remarks on Neal's History of the Puritans.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 7.

former punishment, provoked its repetition. Together with some other members, he was sent to the Tower, at which act of severity the house was so greatly intimidated that the reading of the bill was postponed. The queen commanded the petition of the puritans and the bill before the house to be withdrawn, and sent a message to the commons by their speaker, that she was already settled in her religion, and would not begin again; that changes in religion were dangerous; that it was not reasonable for the commons to call in question the established faith, while others were endeavouring to overthrow it; that she had considered the objections, and found that they were frivolous; and that the platform of discipline, which the puritans wished to establish, was prejudicial to her crown and the peace of her government. So highly incensed was the queen with the attempts of the puritans, at the crisis of an expected invasion from Spain, that, in the customary act of general pardon passed at the end of the session, she commanded an exception to be made of such as committed any offence against the act of uniformity, or were convicted of publishing seditious books and pamphlets.

A. D.  
1587.  
Elizabeth.

The convocation, contrary to its general usage, continued to sit after the parliament had risen, and granted a liberal subsidy to the queen in aid of the war against the popish powers of Europe. Impressed with a conviction that the church was in far greater danger from the puritans, the two houses addressed the queen, offering to maintain by disputation that the puritanical platform of discipline was absurd in theology, and dangerous in politics.

Never was the government of Elizabeth and the

CHAP.  
XIX.1588.  
February.

church of England in greater danger than at this period; and it might be thought that the impending invasion of the king of Spain would, for a time, avert the attention of all parties from their internal dissensions, and direct their hostility against the common foe. Though the armada, vauntingly styled invincible, was confessedly prepared to bring England back to the catholic faith, and though the Romanists in England composed a formidable body\*, yet Elizabeth found that her most dangerous enemies were not among her Romish subjects. In this time of common danger, the puritans forgot their antipathy to the papists, and were indefatigable in dispersing libels against the church and her prelates†. If the Spanish fleet had succeeded in effecting a descent, the consequences might have been fatal to English liberty; but by the opposition of the elements, and the valour of the English navy, not a single Spaniard set his foot on English ground, and not a single Spanish ship was left entire to carry back the intelligence of the disgraceful defeat.

In the time of national danger, the puritans had

\* Cardinal Allen computed the number of Romanists in England, at this time, to be two-thirds of the whole population; a computation of which it is needless to prove the error.—Lingard's History, vol. v. c. 5. 4to.

† Camden's Elizabeth. "Why, wanting your desires, would you have taken no part if the Spaniard had come? Or proposed you to have made a more ready passage for him by rebelling at home before he should have come? Or would you have joined with him, if he had come? Or meant you thereby, through terror, to have enforced her majesty to your purposes, lest you should have taken some of those courses? Choose which of them you list: the best is seditious."—Bancroft's Dangerous Positions, b. iv. c. 3.

pleaded for privileges and indulgences as the price of their uniting against a foreign enemy; and no sooner was the danger past, than they renewed their applications for the subversion of the hierarchy. If there were any part of the government of Elizabeth which deserves reprehension, it was her invasion of the liberty of the press. This being denied to the puritans, while it was enjoyed in a limited degree by the papists\*, puritanical hostility was no longer confined within the bounds of legitimate discussion and fair argument, but vented itself in clandestine libels, replete with scurrility and rancour.

A. D.  
1588.

Elizabeth.

The theological press being under the control of Whitgift, it was needless for the puritans to solicit a licence: they purchased a private press, which they transported from one county to another to prevent discovery. It was first set up at Moulsey, in the county of Surrey, and after having been removed to many different towns, was at length conveyed to Manchester. There it was found by the officers of government; but not till it had completed its destructive work, by multiplying the productions of seditious fanaticism, which its partisans took care to disseminate. The greater part of these libels are consigned to an oblivion from which no historian of any sect or party would willingly rescue them;

\* Neal accuses Whitgift of giving a licence to Ascanio, an Italian merchant and bookseller in London, to import what popish books he thought fit; but it has been shown that the licence was granted on strict conditions, which Ascanio entered into a bond with sureties to fulfil. These books were not to be dispersed, but to be delivered to one of the privy council for a previous examination.—Bishop Maddox's *Vindication*, p. 350.

CHAP.  
XIX.

---

but there is one which is the subject of occasional allusion to point a period, and the name of Martin Marprelate is still familiar as the prototype of puritanical rancour. This violent satire against the hierarchy was written, as it is supposed, by a junto of separatists, for its real authors were never ascertained. Its language was as rude and unbecoming as its spirit was fierce and unchristian.

1589.

The queen, on the publication of this pamphlet, commanded the archbishop to make a diligent inquiry after the printing-press whence it issued, and accompanied her injunction with a proclamation for calling in all seditious and schismatical books, whether printed or written. These books were described in the proclamation as "tending to bring in a monstrous and dangerous innovation, in all manner of ecclesiastical government now in use, of the three ancient estates of the realm under her highness, whereof her majesty mindeth to have a reverend regard." All her loving subjects were, therefore, prohibited from having any such books in their custody, her majesty being minded to have the laws severely executed against the authors and abettors of them, as soon as they were apprehended.

Feb. 13.

When the printing-press was discovered which gave birth to Martin Marprelate, the archbishop wrote to the lord treasurer to institute a prosecution against those persons in whose possession it was found. He recommended that this prosecution should be conducted by the lords of the council, rather than by the high commissioners, because they had already incurred great unpopularity for their support of the government in church and

state\*. Accordingly, those who procured the press, together with the printer and publisher of the libels, were imprisoned by order of the council, and amerced with heavy fines†. Though Whitgift was accused of instigating most of the severities of this reign against ecclesiastical delinquents, yet his conduct in the present instance showed a different spirit. He improved his interest with the queen, and persevered in his intercession till the offenders were released from prison, and their fines remitted. This noble conduct, at any other period, would have received its merited commendation; but in an age when the principles of religious toleration were practised by no party, it was liable to misconstruction. It was imputed by many “to the declining of envy, gaining of applause, and remorse of conscience for over-rigorous proceedings. Thus impossible is it to please forward spirits, and to make them like the deed who dislike the doer‡.” Cartwright was among the number of those who were imprisoned for these seditious libels, and was indebted for his liberation to the interference of Whitgift. On a promise of quiet and peaceable behaviour, this celebrated non-conformist was restored, not only to his liberty, but to his preferment; he was reinstated in his hospital, where he

A. D.  
1589.

Elizabeth.

\* Life of Whitgift by Strype.

† Neal says, “Among the divines who suffered death for these libels was Mr. Udal;” as if he had been put to death by the hands of the executioner: whereas he died in prison, probably, but not certainly, from grief. Bishop Warburton has reprehended this language with due severity. Remarks on Neal.

‡ Fuller’s Church History.



CHAP.  
XIX.

continued without farther molestation during the remainder of his life. He acknowledged the generosity of Whitgift, and admitted "his bond of duty to the archbishop to be so much the straiter as it was without any desert of his own \*."

Whitgift, in exerting his interest with the queen for mitigating the punishment which the puritans had incurred, thought that he had performed only half of his duty: he was careful that the calumnies which they had propagated should be detected and exposed. The libel of Martin Marprelate was answered in a ludicrous style by Bridges, afterwards bishop of Oxford; but Cooper, bishop of Winchester, rendered "more service by his grave and sober reply †." In performing the task, Cooper derived essential assistance from the archbishop, who, being shamefully aspersed, furnished replies to the particular charges brought against him.

1590  
and  
1591.

The cause of puritanism suffered from these scurrilous libels, and it was still more sensibly injured by its connexion with some blasphemous enthusiasts, who appeared at this time. These were, the notorious Hacket, with his two prophets, Arthington and Coppinger. Hacket was not less ignorant than seditious and profane; he was unable even to read: but he pretended to be king Jesus,

\* Life of Whitgift, by sir G. Paul. In his latter years, Cartwright became a controversialist in behalf of the church of England, and expressed his concern for the schism which he had caused. Neal uncandidly says that he ended his days in sorrow.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 8. Cooper was answered in a pamphlet, entitled "Ha' ye any Work for the Cooper?" And in a second, "More Work for the Cooper."

and to set up his own empire in England instead of the existing sovereignty. He defaced the royal arms, and stabbed the queen's picture with a dagger in the house where he lodged. Being apprehended and put upon the rack, he made a full confession; and on his trial pleaded his guilt, declaring that he was instigated by the Spirit. The execution of his sentence followed, and his conduct at his death displayed insanity. Coppinger starved himself in prison; but Arthington lived to recover his senses, and was pardoned. The most popular, though not the most candid historian of these times, has endeavoured to exculpate the puritans from any share in this mixture of rebellion and blasphemy: but he has confessed that the business happened unseasonably for the presbyterians. He boldly avers, that "they detested his blasphemies as cordially as the episcopal party: and such of them as loved Hacket the non-conformist, abhorred Hacket the heretic, after he had mounted to so high a pitch of impiety." But the charge of participation in rebellion was not at the time so easily cleared. Cartwright thought it necessary to write an elaborate apology for himself and his brethren, disclaiming all connexion with these enthusiasts: but his arguments and explanations were unsatisfactory to all but his own party.

A. D.  
1592.  
Elizabeth.

At the opening of the new parliament, the queen signified her pleasure to the house of commons, that they might redress such civil grievances as were complained of in their respective counties; but must leave all matters of the state to herself and the council, and all matters of the church to herself and the bishops. This was not a mandate

1593.  
Feb. 19.

---

CHAP.  
XIX.

which might be disobeyed with impunity. Wentworth and Bromley having moved the house to address the queen, praying her to name a successor, were both committed to prison, where Wentworth remained several years \*. When a motion was made that the queen should be solicited to release the imprisoned members, it was answered by those of the house who were privy counsellors, that the queen having committed them for causes best known to herself, the house could not call her to account for what she did by her own authority, and that it was highly unbecoming to discuss such matters.

When there was so little licence granted to the commons in treating affairs of state, it was “a bold adventure of Morrice, attorney of the court of wards, to move an inquiry into the proceedings of the bishops in their spiritual courts †.” He said, that the bishops could not justify their proceedings, their inquisition, their subscriptions, their binding the queen’s subjects contrary to the laws of God and the realm, their compelling men to take oaths in crimination of themselves, and, on refusal, degrading, depriving, and imprisoning them at pleasure, and not releasing them till they had complied. At the same time when he uttered this strong invective, he submitted two bills to the house, one against the oath *ex officio*, and the other against illegal imprisonment. Having moved that the last bill be read immediately, sir Francis Knollys seconded the motion, and said that in his

\* Heylin’s Hist. of Presbyt. p 319. D’Ewes’s Journal of the House of Commons.

† Strype’s Life of Whitgift.

opinion these abuses ought to be reformed. He added, that after the reformation of Henry the Eighth, no bishop exercised a superiority over his brethren; that in the reign of Edward the Sixth a statute was enacted, obliging the bishops to hold their courts in the king's name; and although this statute was repealed by queen Mary, and not since revived, yet it was doubtful whether the bishops had authority to hold their courts in their own name, because this was a manifest usurpation on the royal prerogative, and because no subject could legally hold a court without a licence from the crown. If it were argued that the bishops held their courts by prescription, or by the statute of Henry the Eighth, which gave to the bishops the same authority under the king which they had possessed under the pope, he answered, that there was a clause in the act which restrained them from invading the king's prerogative and the laws and customs of the realm. But another member followed on the same side, and added, that the bishops had transgressed the law, because the statute of Elizabeth required subscription to articles of faith only; that this limitation was made by the lords after the bill had passed the commons; and that no councils or canons gave authority to the bishops to frame articles, and to require subscriptions at their pleasure.

A. D.  
1593.  
Elizabeth.

These speeches called up the civilians of the house, and particularly Daulton, who opposed the reading of the bill, because the queen had often prohibited the commons from meddling with the affairs of the church; a fact which the house too well knew. As soon as the queen was informed of the

CHAP.  
XIX.

purport of the debate, she sent for Coke, the speaker, and commanded him to declare to the house that it was wholly in her power to determine, to assent, and to dissent, with regard to any thing done in parliament; that her intention, in calling the present parliament, was only that God might be more religiously served, and that those who neglected his service might be compelled to reformation by some severe laws, and also that the safety of her person and her realm might be secured. It was not in her intention that the commons should interfere in matters of state or ecclesiastical causes, and she wondered that they should attempt a thing contrary to her injunctions. It was her pleasure that the two bills before the house should be withdrawn; and if any bill concerning ecclesiastical matters should hereafter be exhibited, "upon my allegiance," said the speaker, "I am commanded not to read it \*."

The members who had distinguished themselves by their bold speeches on the popular side felt the weight of the royal displeasure. Beal was forbidden to come within the verge of the court, and was commanded to absent himself from the parliament. Morrice was apprehended in the house by a serjeant-at-arms, discharged from his office in the court of the duchy of Lancaster, disabled from practising in his profession, and confined for some years in Tutbury castle.

A parliament in which freedom of speech was proscribed †, and which submitted to such a re-

\* D'Ewes's Journal.

† To the customary request by the speaker Coke, for liberty of speech, the lord-keeper answered, in the queen's name,

straint, was easily persuaded to enact one of the most severe statutes on record. It is entitled "An act for the punishment of persons obstinately refusing to come to church, and persuading others to impugn the queen's authority in ecclesiastical causes \*." By this law, any person above the age of sixteen years who should obstinately refuse to repair to some place of public worship, according to the use of the church of England, for the space of one month, without lawful cause, or should, "by printing, writing, or express words," endeavour to persuade any of the queen's subjects to deny or resist her power and authority in ecclesiastical causes, or should dissuade them from coming to church, or should be present at any unlawful conventicle, under colour or pretext of the exercise of religion; the person thus offending, being lawfully convicted, was subjected to imprisonment until he conformed himself to the laws, and made an humble acknowledgment of his past offence, and gave a promise of future obedience. And in case the offender obstinately refused to submit, and to sign the acknowledgment within three months after conviction, he was obliged to abjure the realm †.

A. D.  
1693.  
Elizabeth.

The moderate puritans contrived to evade the

"As to privilege of speech, it is granted; but you must know what privilege you have: it is not a licence for every man to speak what he lists, or to throw out every fancy that comes into his brain: your privilege is to say Yea or No." D'Ewes's *Journal of the House of Lords*.

\* St. 35 Elizabeth, c. 1.

† A similar statute was enacted against popish recusants, by which they were confined within five miles of their respective dwellings. St. 35 Eliz. c. 2.

CHAP.  
XIX.

---

force of this statute by coming to church when the prayers were almost concluded, and by receiving the communion in those churches where it was not administered in strict conformity with the rubric and canons. But the full weight of this penal law was felt by those separatists, who had renounced all communion with the church, in preaching, and in the sacraments, as well as in the celebration of divine service. Those violent separatists who have been already noticed under the name of Brownists had lately assumed the title of Barrowists, from one Barrow, a gentleman of the Temple, who was become their leader. The distinguishing tenets of this sect have been described; and their members had greatly increased since they had been abandoned by their original founder. Sir Walter Raleigh stated in the house of commons, that there were not less than twenty thousand, divided into several congregations, in Norfolk, Essex, and the vicinity of London.

The congregation in London had procured a place of worship, and had elected proper officers for the government of the congregation. Their form of worship, and of administering the sacraments, were distinguished by some peculiarities deserving notice. The sacrament of baptism was administered without sponsors, the practice of immersion was abolished, the minister washing the face of the person baptized, and pronouncing the customary words. The Lord's supper was administered in the following manner: five white loaves being placed on the table, the pastor invoked the divine blessing, after which, having

broken the bread, he delivered it to the deacons, and the deacons distributed it among the congregation. The posture of the communicants was that of standing or sitting round the table, but the form of words accompanying the distribution differed little from that used by the church of England \*.

A. D.  
1593.

Elizabeth.

This congregation being obliged to meet in different places, in order to escape the vigilance of government, was at length discovered in Islington, in the very same place where a protestant congregation had assembled in the reign of queen Mary. A large number was immediately apprehended, and sent to different prisons. At their examination they confessed that they had been accustomed to assemble to pray and expound the Scriptures, and vindicated themselves for separating from the church of England. Some of the prisoners submitted their case to the privy council; but their petition contained so many intemperate reflections on the hierarchy that it received no answer. They next addressed the lord treasurer Burghley, but with as little success. A few of these unfortunate men, after having suffered a long imprisonment, were executed for writing and publishing seditious books, among whom were Barrow and Greenwood, who, at the place of execution, professed piety to God, and loyalty to their sovereign.

April 6.

A few weeks after the execution of Barrow, John Penry†, a Welsh divine, suffered in the same manner; the circumstances of whose life are too remarkable to be passed over. His learning was

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 8.

† Or, Ap Henry.



CHAP.  
XIX.

not contemptible, but he was equally deficient in judgment and in temper. He had preached in both universities with approbation, and afterwards travelling into Wales, was the first, as he said, that preached the gospel publicly to the Welsh, and sowed the good seed among his countrymen. His earliest publications were a "View of such Public Wants and Disorders as are in her Majesty's Country of Wales, with an Humble Petition to the High Court of Parliament for Redress;" and, "An Exhortation to the Governors and People of her Majesty's Country of Wales to have the Preaching of the Gospel planted among them."

When Martin Marprelate, and the other satirical pamphlets against the bishops were published, a special warrant issued from the privy council to apprehend Penry, as an enemy to the state. To avoid being taken, he retired into Scotland, and in that country employed his time in framing a petition, or rather an address, to the queen, on the state of religion. Its design was to show that Elizabeth was ignorant of the many abuses in the church of England, and an intercession for her permission to preach the gospel in his native country. The language of this address was not calculated to gain the favour which he solicited, and one passage must be quoted as a specimen of its offensive style: "Among the rest of the princes under the gospel who have been drawn in to oppose it, you must consider yourself to be one; for until you see this, you see not yourself; and they are but sycophants and flatterers whoever tell you otherwise. The practice of your government shows, that if you could have lived without the

gospel, it would have been doubtful whether the gospel should have been established or not; for now that you are established on your throne by the gospel, you suffer it to reach no farther than the end of your sceptre limiteth unto it.”

A. D.  
1593.

Elizabeth.

When he had finished this address, he brought it with him from Scotland, resolving, if he should find an opportunity, to deliver it to the queen with his own hand: but, on his arrival in London, he was seized, and his manuscripts were subjected to a severe scrutiny. From these manuscripts, and other papers found in his possession, were drawn his articles of accusation. He was indicted for uttering seditious words and rumours against the queen, tending to stir up rebellion among her subjects, a crime which, by the late statute, amounted to felony. It was at first designed to indict him for his printed books; but, by the advice of his council, he delivered in court a remonstrance, showing that he was not in danger of the law for any books published in his name. He observed, that the late statute was not intended against such as only wrote against the hierarchy, for then it must condemn many of the most learned protestants at home and abroad, but against such as defamed the royal authority. This he had not done; but his writings were loyal, as his deportment was that of an obedient subject. The court, apprehending that this remonstrance might occasion a legal argument, which would ultimately turn to the advantage of the prisoner, set aside his printed books, and convicted him on the petition and the unpublished papers found in his possession. Such a proceeding, being manifestly illegal, gave

**CHAP.  
XIX.**

rise to an eloquent and affecting appeal on the part of the prisoner. The lord treasurer Burghley, to whom it was addressed, could never have read the following passage without emotion : “ The cause is most lamentable, that the private observations of a student, being in a foreign land, and wishing well to his native country, should bring his life, with blood, to a violent end ; especially seeing they are most private, and so imperfect, that they have no coherence at all in them, and in most places carry no true English. Though my innocence may stand me in no stead before an earthly tribunal, yet I know that I shall have the reward thereof before the judgment-seat of the great King, and the merciful Lord, who relieves the fatherless and the widow, will reward my desolate orphans and friendless widow that I leave behind me, and even hear their cry ; for he is merciful.”

In the protestation inclosed in this letter, he declared that he wrote his observations in Scotland ; that they were the substance of certain objections made by persons, which he intended to examine, and perhaps to refute ; that even in those writings, so unfinished, and intended only for private use, he had shown his dutifulness to the queen, and had never entertained even a secret wandering thought of disloyalty.

Whatever opinion may be entertained of the credibility of these assertions, when compared with his overt acts, and with the tendency of his writings ; yet the illegality of his conviction cannot be disproved, nor the harsh treatment justified, which he experienced on his trial, and even at his execution. While he was at dinner, he received a message from

the sheriff, commanding him to hold himself in readiness, for he must die that afternoon. Accordingly he was carried in a cart to the place where he was to suffer, and was not permitted to speak to the people, to make any profession of his faith in God, or of his loyalty to his prince.

A. D.  
1593.  
Elizabeth.

The execution of these Brownists, uniting sedition with fanaticism, appears to have wrought a change in the temper of the government. Their professions of piety and loyalty, however insincere or fallacious, when uttered in their dying moments, excited the compassion of the people for their sufferings. The court of high commission incurred no small portion of resentment, and the queen herself expressed displeasure at its arbitrary rigour. A resolution was therefore adopted: instead of punishing the puritans with death, to send them into banishment\*.

It is gratifying to turn from the penal laws of Elizabeth, instruments which are always ineffectual in suppressing or in propagating truth, but through which error often derives strength and perpetuity. It is still more gratifying, that the attention can now be directed to the only fair and successful warfare against error, that which was maintained by the divines of the church of England against puritanism. Its extravagant and pernicious tenets gave rise to those vindications of protestant episcopacy, which the puritans of this age could not answer, and which are regarded by subsequent ages as models of theological controversy.

The indefatigable zeal and the literary pro-

\* Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 8.

---

**CHAP.  
XIX.**

ductions of Whitgift have been already mentioned with that approbation which they deserve; and they will be read with interest and profit. They are an evidence of a vigorous mind, acute in detecting the sophistry, and reckless in exposing the fallacious but seductive rhetoric, of his adversaries. Bancroft possessed a more popular style than Whitgift, and a high degree of that impassioned oratory in which the puritans excelled. In the pulpit of Saint Paul's cross he gave a glowing, but not an overcharged, description of puritanism; showing its tendency to overturn the monarchy as well as the hierarchy, and forcibly appealing to such of the aristocracy as encouraged puritanical principles, whether they would willingly have these principles carried to their full extent? At the time when the apostles and ministers of the gospel had neither silver nor gold, and were persecuted from city to city, their wealthy converts sold their estates, and laid the money at the feet of these poor and persecuted apostles. Poverty and humility are not to be practised by the teachers of religion alone, but are obligatory in an equal degree on all Christians. Of those who wished to revive the practice of the apostolic age, the preacher pertinently inquired, how they would like a community of goods? If they were unwilling that such a doctrine should be practised on themselves, they should be cautious how they urged it against the clergy.

The arguments which Bancroft urged with such effect in a sermon, Saravia asserted in a treatise. This eminent divine, a German by birth, quitted his native country when the purity of the Christian ministry was an article of the public confession of

faith, and cast himself on the protection of the church of England\*. Before his departure from Germany he had rendered an essential service to episcopacy by his answer to Beza; and no sooner had he been received into the communion of the English church than he proved his title to its privileges. Thoroughly conversant in ecclesiastical antiquity, he displayed his superiority in this branch of theological learning, by a treatise on the different orders of the Christian ministry†, and incontrovertibly proved, that bishops were not only of a superior degree, but of a different order, from priests.

A. D.

Elizabeth.

1590.

Saravia, in the age of Elizabeth, was cherished by the church of England for his own sake; by posterity his memory will be venerated chiefly because he was the chosen friend of one whose writings have survived the lapse of time, accompanied by changes in opinion and in language. Of Saravia it is enough to say, that he was the friend of HOOKER.

If Hooker had not lived, it would have been incumbent on an historian of the English church to have set forward the arguments of the other adversaries of puritanism in full display and dilata-tion: but the energy of Whitgift, the eloquence of Bancroft, and the mildness of Saravia, are combined in that immortal work, THE ECCLESIAS-TICAL POLITY.

That this work is still considered as the standard to which the church of England may confidently

\* He was prebendary of Canterbury.

† Entitled "De Diversis Gradibus Ministrorum Evangelii."

CHAP.  
XIX.

---

appeal, as exhibiting the true, settled, and catholic principles of the English reformation, is an unanswerable proof of its excellence. It derives no adventitious weight from the character or circumstances of its author, nor from its accommodation to the prejudices of a particular age. Never was any work less indicative of its author's character: Hooker was of a temper artless, retiring, and contemplative, remarkable for his ignorance of the world, and his unsuspecting simplicity: but the Ecclesiastical Polity is the performance of a man who had attentively studied, and therefore could accurately develop, the motives of human actions; it is the performance of a keen and penetrating observer of popular opinions and of passing events; and the style possesses the graphic distinctness of one who has mingled in the business of life. His description of the puritans is one of the most vivid and masterly portraits which was ever drawn by a human pen\*.

Yet Hooker, throughout the largest portion of his life, lived either in the seclusion of a college, or in the obscurity of a country parish. The only preferment which brought him into active life was the mastership of the Temple; and this station opposition and intrigue, joined with his love of retirement and hatred of contention, soon induced him to quit.

If the writings of Hooker derive no weight from his character, they derive no popularity from his accommodation to prevailing opinion. The times in which he lived were adverse to the reception of those principles on which his Ecclesiastical Polity

\* Eccl. Pol. Pref.

is founded. Both papists and puritans, however opposed on other points, agreed in this, that the civil power was subordinate to the ecclesiastical. Both parties maintained that civil government was derived from the will of the people; and the doctrine was taught for the purpose of justifying resistance. By the papists, civil government was considered as nothing more than an emanation from the spiritual power; and, according to their tenets, the power of the keys ought to control that of the sword. The civil magistrate was bound to execute the decrees of the pope, the vicegerent of Christ, and, in case of disobedience, might be deposed. The popes had acted in conformity to this doctrine with regard to England: the reigning pontiff had threatened to depose Edward the Sixth, and had actually deposed Elizabeth\*. An exertion of spiritual authority so unpopular, the Jesuits had endeavoured to render acceptable by the inculcation of a popular dogma, that all civil government is derived from the people.

A. D.

Elizabeth.

The puritans entertained the same notions concerning the subjection of kings and civil magistrates to the holy discipline of the church. Calvin had asserted the power of the keys as strongly as the see of Rome, and maintained that, "to a minister with his eldership power is given by the law of God to excommunicate even kings and princes themselves." The most devoted adherents of the see of Rome held that kings were bound to execute its bulls, as far as they could; and the puritans as strongly insisted that a church constituted on a presbyterian basis had the sole power of de-

\* Bishop Warburton's Letters to Bishop Hurd.



CHAP.  
XIX.

fining matters of faith, and of distinguishing between necessary and unnecessary points of doctrine, and also that the civil magistrate was obliged to enforce the decisions of the church. They did not rest here, for they maintained that he was bound to suppress all sects and heresies, and all opinions contrary to sound doctrine. The civil magistrate who failed in the performance of this sacred duty ceased to be a child of God, and might be deprived of that dominion which was founded on grace. That the sceptre might be transferred from the reprobate to the elect was their favourite maxim, and the Calvinists in Holland carried it into practice, when, upon some remissness in the states to suppress heretical opinions, they sent a deputation of their clergy, offering to Elizabeth the sovereignty of six of the Belgic provinces.

To combat these dangerous opinions, to preserve the person of the sovereign inviolate, and the kingdom from anarchy, to raise the superstructure of civil government on a foundation more secure than the uncertain will of the multitude, many of the episcopalian divines went into a contrary extreme. They laid the foundation of all human sovereignty in divine right, and hence inferred that, as the civil magistrate was amenable to no court of human judicature, he was accountable to God alone. Resistance to the unlawful commands of a lawful governor was a crime, and rebellion was worse than idolatry, and it was not more justifiable on account of an infringement of the laws, than on account of the personal vices of the sovereign.

Hooker coincided with neither of these parties, but, superior to every interested consideration, fol-

lowed truth\*. The design of his Ecclesiastical Polity, as stated by himself, was to settle the existing controversies on religion and government, and to “follow the light of sound and sincere judgment, without either cloud of prejudice or mist of passionate affection†.” In his introduction, he first considered what law is in general, and then distinguished its several kinds, and the obligations which each kind imposes. Having laid this foundation, he proceeded to undermine “the main pillar” of the puritanical fabric, that Scripture ought to be the only rule of human actions. The other and weaker stay of their fabric was, that since God is both the teacher and governor of his church, there must of necessity be found in Scripture “some particular form of ecclesiastical polity, the laws whereof admit not any kind of alteration.” The first three books being devoted to the consideration of these fundamental points, the fourth proceeded, “from the general grounds and foundations of the puritanical discipline,” to answer the general accusations of the puritans against the church of England. Their general allegation was, that the apostolical form of church polity was corrupted by manifold popish rites and ceremonies, and that the foreign reformed churches had given an example which England ought to follow. From this general accusation a transition was made to particular charges, and these were discussed in the four remaining books. The fifth book contained an examination of the objections against the book of common prayer and administration of the sacra-

A. D.

Elizabeth.

\* Bishop Warburton.

† Pref. to Eccles. Polity.

CHAP.  
XIX.

ments. The sixth and seventh books relate to "the power of jurisdiction," and two questions are therein discussed: the one, whether laymen, such as governing elders, ought to be invariably vested with this power? the other, whether bishops may have that power over other pastors, and that accession of temporal dignity, which they possess in the English church? "And because, besides the power of order which all consecrated persons have, and the power of jurisdiction which neither they all nor they only have, there is a third power, a power of ecclesiastical dominion," which is communicable to persons not ecclesiastical, and which ought to be restrained to the sovereign of the whole body politic: the eighth and last book was allotted to this question, and the objections against the regal supremacy in ecclesiastical causes fully answered. A church and a commonwealth are things in nature distinguished from each other; but in the opinion of some, a church and a commonwealth are not only distinguished in nature and definition, but perpetually severed in substance, so that they who belong to the one can neither themselves execute, nor appoint persons to execute, the duties of the other. The causes of this popular but dangerous error are rightly assigned: the one, because the professors of the true religion, living under a government professing a false religion, are constrained to form a religious society separate from the body politic; the other, because things appertaining to religion are always administered by an order of men distinguished from other orders; whence arises a fallacious notion of a total separation of the church from the commonwealth.

In treating the origin of civil government, **A. D.**  
Hooker has avoided the errors both of the papists \_\_\_\_\_  
and the puritans, without falling into those of **Elizabeth.**  
many divines of the English church. When God  
created man, his Creator endued him with power  
to guide himself into what kind of society he might  
choose to live. Society is necessary to the pre-  
servation of mankind, and government is essential  
to society. Government in general is the appoint-  
ment of God, and in this respect it is a divine or-  
dinance; but to man is left the power of framing  
and modifying government, and in this respect it  
is a human ordinance. Where kingly power is  
established, all kings have not an equal authority:  
there are kings who reign by conquest, and there-  
fore make their own charter; there are kings who  
reign by the special appointment of God, and there-  
fore enjoy that degree of authority which God has  
assigned; and there are kings who reign by com-  
position or agreement, and their authority is limited  
by the articles of compact between them and their  
subjects. Articles of compact are defined to be  
not merely those which have been at first solemnly  
ratified, and which have been effaced from the  
memory; but those which have received a volun-  
tary assent, of which positive laws are the evidence,  
or a tacit allowance of which, immemorial pre-  
scription is the proof.

That the civil magistrate is invested with autho-  
rity over all classes, ecclesiastical as well as civil,  
Hooker maintains against the objections of Calvin.  
The reformer of Geneva had condemned the title  
assumed by Henry the Eighth, of "head of the  
church under Christ." Hooker vindicates this title

CHAP.  
XIX.

from the charge of blasphemy, and shows that the title of "head" is used to denote any kind of superiority or pre-eminence, and that the headship given to the king over the ecclesiastical state widely differs from that claimed by Jesus Christ over his church. The headship given to kings "is altogether visibly exercised, and ordereth only the external frame of church affairs:" the headship ascribed to Christ is supreme, absolute, and spiritual; so that it differs from the headship of earthly kings in order, in degree, and in essence.

It was a popular opinion among the sectarists of those days, that even if the ecclesiastical supremacy be conceded to the civil magistrate, yet the power of ecclesiastical legislation ought not to be vested in a king and a temporal parliament. The sovereign not having this power in himself, cannot communicate it to his parliament; for the power resides in the spiritual pastors of the Christian church. Here an opportunity presented itself for a clear explanation of Hooker's principles of church government. "The parliament of England," he observes, "together with the convocation annexed thereto, is that whereupon the very essence of all government within this kingdom doth depend; it is even the very body of the whole realm, and consisteth of the king and of all that within the realm are subject to him. The parliament is a court not so merely temporal as if it might meddle with nothing but leather or wool. Those days of queen Mary are not forgotten wherein the realm did submit itself to the legate of pope Julius, at which time had it been thought that there is no more force in laws made by parliament concerning church

affairs, than if men should take upon them to make ordinances for the hierarchies of angels in heaven, the former statutes concerning religion might have been taken to be abrogated without any repeal." "Had they," he asks, "power to repeal laws already made, and none to make laws for the government of the church? It is allowed that, in spiritual matters, in framing a liturgy, in drawing up articles of faith, in prescribing ceremonies, bishops and spiritual pastors are far more competent than men of secular occupations. But when their wisdom has done its best, it is the general consent of all classes, both temporal and spiritual, which gives to their labours the form and vigour of laws, without which they would be nothing more than wholesome admonitions and instructions." "Wherefore," he concludes, "to determine ecclesiastical matters by way of assent and approbation is within the province and competence of parliament."

A. D.

Elizabeth.

The preceding detail is intended not as an analysis of Hooker's work, but as a specimen of his reasoning. That his Ecclesiastical Polity has answered the end which its author proposed, few will be disposed to deny: he has razed the unsightly structure of the Calvinistic discipline, and dissipated its fragile materials. His doctrinal tenets, as they were in his own time the subject of exception and cavil, so they have been since received with qualified approbation, even when they have not been met with dissent. On his first public appearance as a preacher, he delivered a doctrine contrary to the great oracle of the foreign church, Calvin: that in God there were two wills, an an-

CHAP.  
XIX.

tecedent and a consequent will. The first, or antecedent, will of God was, that all mankind should be saved; but his second will was, that those only should be saved whose lives were answerable to that degree of grace which he had offered or afforded to them.

This notion, for which Hooker incurred the censure of Travers, he defended in a separate treatise; and he has also maintained the same distinction in his Ecclesiastical Polity. Such a belief he held to be the only foundation of prayer in behalf of all conditions of men. "Our prayers for all men do include both them that shall find mercy, and them also that shall find none. For them that shall, no man will doubt that our prayers are both accepted and granted. Touching them for whom we crave that mercy which is not to be obtained, let us not think that our Saviour did misinstruct his disciples, willing them to pray for the peace even of such as should be incapable of so great a blessing. And if any man should doubt how God should accept such prayers, in case they should be opposite to his will, or not grant them according to that which himself willeth, our answer is, that such suits God accepteth, in that they are conformable to his general inclination, which is, that all mankind might be saved; yet always he granteth them not, forasmuch as there is in God sometimes a more private occasional will, which determineth the contrary. So that the other being the rule of our actions, and not this, our requests for things opposite to this will of God are not therefore the less gracious in his sight\*."

\* Eccles. Polity, b. 5. s. 49.

If this doctrine of Hooker excited against him a formidable opposition, he had the courage and the charity to maintain another doctrine, still more unpalatable than that the will of God was that all mankind should be saved. In one of his sermons, he was bold enough to say, that he doubted not that God was merciful to many of our forefathers living in popish superstition, forasmuch as they sinned ignorantly; in other words, he admitted the possibility that papists might obtain salvation. This charitable, this Christian supposition, startled Whitgift, and was not assented to by the primate without qualifying its terms. But it was encountered by the unqualified denial of Travers, who argued that it was impossible for papists to be saved, because they sought to be justified by the merit of their works, and so overthrow the foundation of faith. Hooker, when he defended his position, was careful to obviate any misconstruction of his words, and fully admitted the great protestant doctrine, that man is justified by the merits of Christ. "There is no meritorious cause of our salvation but Christ, no effectual but his mercy. We deny the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; we abuse, disannul, and annihilate the benefit of his passion, if, by a proud imagination, we believe that we can merit everlasting life, or can be worthy of it. This belief is to destroy the very essence of our justification\*. But considering how many virtuous and just men, how many saints, how many martyrs, how many of the ancient fathers of the church have had their dangerous opinions, of

A. D.

Elizabeth.

\* Discourse on Justification. Works, vol. iii. 8vo.



CHAP.  
XIX.

which human merit was one, shall any man bē so bold as to write on their graves, that for such men there is no salvation? Surely," he adds, "I must confess, that if it be an error to think that God may be merciful to save men when they err, my greatest comfort is my error: were it not for the love that I bear to this error, I could never wish to speak or live."

When Hooker and Travers were associated at the Temple, it was said, that "the morning sermon spake Canterbury, and the afternoon Geneva\*." This must be understood of Hooker's agreement in discipline with the English church, and that in discipline the English and Genevan churches were diametrically opposite. How far Hooker agreed with Canterbury, or how far Canterbury and Geneva were opposed in doctrine, will be the subject of a future investigation. The present disquisition will close with a general character of the writings of the illustrious divine, whose life is so intimately connected with the history of the national church.

It is not the erudition of Hooker, for in erudition he has been surpassed; it is that comprehensive intellect, which was not warped or fettered by prejudice; it is the intense piety by which that powerful intellect was chastened and refined, which has given perpetuity to his writings. His Ecclesiastical Polity was suggested by the theological controversies of his own times; but it is still read when those controversies are forgotten, and its perusal is not confined to mere theologians. Though all his writings are controversial, yet they have the

\* Isaac Walton's *Life of Hooker*.

point of controversy without its venom. The vein of animated piety, which insinuates itself into the body of his argument, has not transmuted his materials, but has conferred on them consistence and durability. Calumny, whether directed against his person, or his opinions, could never provoke his Christian meekness into anger, and still less into recrimination. The spirit which dictated the following sentence, in reply to one of his opponents, was ever present: "Your next argument consists of railing and reasons: to your railing I say nothing, to your reasons I say what follows."

A. D.

Elizabeth.

Whatever treatment Hooker might have experienced from the malice and the envy of his contemporaries, yet his posthumous fame was not slow, though imperceptible, in its progress. Though no writer combated the Romanists with greater success, yet, to their honour, they have liberally celebrated his praise. The encomium of a Roman pontiff\* might have been inscribed on his tomb: "There is no learning that this man hath not searched into, nothing too hard for his understanding: this man indeed deserves the name of an author; his books will get reverence by age, for there is in them such seeds of eternity, that they shall remain till the last fire shall consume all learning."

From the subject matter of the Ecclesiastical Polity, a transition is naturally made to its style. Camden, in praising the modesty and the other eminent qualities of Hooker, has expressed a wish that, for the honour of this kingdom, and the ad-

\* Clement VIII. Walton's *Life of Hooker*.

---

**CHAP.  
XIX.**

vantage of other nations, his work had been composed in the Latin language, on account of its universality. The English scholar and the English divine will prefer its present garb, because it has conferred immortality on their native tongue. The Ecclesiastical Polity, independently of its subject, and considered merely as a composition, is, beyond comparison, the greatest work of the Elizabethan age. It is not from any predilection for the opinions of Hooker that his style will be preferred, not to his contemporaries, but to one who lived more than a generation after him; to Milton. The style of Hooker, when compared with that of Milton, possesses equal harmony, more dignity, and, which is strange to say, more courtliness. Hooker, though he had not enjoyed, like Milton, the advantages of foreign travel, was well acquainted with "seemly arts and affairs:" he had a taste for painting, he had an exquisite sense of music, and in the rhythm of his periods may be detected the latent seeds of poetry.

It is impossible to conclude these reflections without expressing the gratifying thought that a work, whose existence must be coeval with the national language, is consecrated to the defence of THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

## CHAPTER XX.

Progress of doctrinal Calvinism.—Disputes at Cambridge.—  
 Predestinarian Controversy.—Lambeth Articles.—Schism  
 between the Jesuits and Seculars.—Death of Elizabeth.—  
 Accession of James.—State of the Scottish Church.—Whit-  
 gift sends Nevil into Scotland.—Assurances of James to pro-  
 tect the Church of England.—Millenary Petition.—Hamp-  
 ton-court Conference.

THAT the earliest reformers of the English A. D.  
 church, however they might differ in their notions  
 of discipline, were of the same mind in points of  
 doctrine, is a proposition which, however con-  
 fidently assumed, cannot be admitted without  
 limitations. The proposition is true, if understood  
 to imply that there were certain doctrines which the  
 English reformers were unanimous in maintaining  
 against the church of Rome; yet a difficulty will  
 still remain, in ascertaining what these doctrines  
 really were. It has been already shown that the  
 essential points of difference between the two  
 churches were reduced to these two: the papal  
 supremacy and the corporal presence. Other points  
 there were, concerning which the Christian church  
 has been divided from the apostolic age, on which  
 the Romanists and reformers disagreed among  
 themselves: but this difference of opinion was no  
 obstacle to church communion, either with the  
 Romish or reformed churches.

Elizabeth.

CHAP.  
XX.

Among those points in which a latitude of opinion was allowed by the church of Rome, must be reckoned those abstruse and inexplicable questions,

Of Providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,  
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute :

questions on which speculation too frequently ends in distraction and scepticism ; and discussion, instead of inspiring humility and moderation, leads to impious presumption and interminable discord.

Such questions, at the time of the reformation, were not authoritatively decided by a church fond of deciding, and arrogating to its decisions the claim of infallibility. The real opinions of Augustin, bishop of Hippo, the successful antagonist of Pelagius on predestination and grace, have been as variously represented as the questions themselves have been fiercely agitated ; for opposite sects have claimed him as their own. But it is certain that Augustin was generally esteemed the oracle of the Latin church, as Cassian was the oracle of the Greek church. Of the two great rival orders, the Dominicans denied free will, in which they were followed by the Augustinians, and, with a few exceptions, by the Benedictines. A large majority of the monastic orders, including, at their first institution, the Jesuits, adhered to the doctrine of Augustin ; and Bellarmine himself was formed in the Augustinian school. The council of Trent, therefore, in framing its decrees on these intricate questions, had shown a neutrality which pleased all and offended none\*.

\* Heylin's *Quinquarticular Hist.* p. 16.

Among the earliest reformers there was a similar diversity of opinion, and a similar latitude was allowed. Luther was originally an Augustinian friar, and as he had embraced the opinions of his master before he separated from the church of Rome, it can only be said that he did not abandon them when he began the reformation. Unguarded and dangerous is the admission, that Luther espoused the opinions of Augustin, as most opposite to the corruptions of the church of Rome; because these opinions have been espoused by the most zealous Romanists. The Romish doctrines, of merit and works of supererogation, can be combated without embracing predestination; as the popish doctrines, of purgatory, masses for the dead, and indulgences, may be overthrown without embracing materialism\*.

A. D.

Elizabeth.

Zuinglius, in opposition to Luther, asserted free will; and so far was he from adopting the doctrine of a divine decree, absolute, arbitrary, and unconditional, by which the future condition of each individual was determined, that he went into the contrary extreme: he taught that the kingdom of heaven was attainable by all who lived according to the dictates of right reason†.

When Calvin returned to Geneva, and the Helvetian church was committed to his government, he entirely reformed its doctrine. It was an essential article of his system that God, in predestinating from all eternity one part of mankind to everlasting

\* The author of the Confessional recommends materialism on this ground. Pref. to first edit. p. 85, note.

† See Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. cent. xvi. sect. 3. part 2, note, and the authors quoted in proof of this assertion.

CHAP.  
XX.

---

happiness, and another to endless misery, was led to make this distinction by no other motive than his good pleasure and free will. This capital tenet of the Calvinistic scheme was not only defended by its author with great strength of argument, but was made by him an essential requisite of communion with the Genevan church. Those whom he could not convince, he could excommunicate; and the examples of Castalio and Bolsec may be cited, to prove that the doctrine of absolute predestination could not be opposed at Geneva with impunity\*.

So great was the reputation of Calvin that, although he was not the original assertor of the predestinarian tenets, yet the name of DOCTRINAL CALVINISTS was assumed by those who, dissenting from the Calvinistic discipline, embraced the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute and irrespective decrees. The appellation was given inaccurately to such as received Calvin's doctrine in a moderated sense; it was indiscriminately bestowed on the Sublapsarians and the Supralapsarians, though Calvin himself adopted the Supralapsarian hypothesis.

Doctrinal Calvinism was esteemed the standard of orthodoxy in most of the foreign theological seminaries of the reformed churches. But as the doctrines of the Genevese reformer had not been incorporated into the protestant confessions of faith†, there were not wanted eminent men by

\* For an account of Castalio and Bolsec the reader is referred to Bayle's Dictionary.

† None of the foreign protestant churches assert in their confessions the absolute decree of reprobation. The Helvetic confession goes so far as to assert irrespective election, sect. 10.

whom they were entirely rejected. Among these A. D.  
 opponents was an individual who had himself re-  
 ceived his education in the university of Geneva, Elizabeth.  
 and had consequently imbibed the doctrinal tenets  
 of Calvin.

Arminius had arrived at the age of maturity 1591.  
 before he was induced to enter into an examina-  
 tion of the religious opinions in which he had been  
 educated; but when a careful examination had  
 convinced him of their erroneousness, he promptly  
 and publicly announced his conversion. His high  
 merit had been rewarded by a theological pro-  
 fessorship in the university of Leyden; and, as his  
 dogmata must have great weight in forming the  
 opinions of his pupils, he thought it incumbent,  
 from motives of honour and conscience, to declare  
 his dissent from the Calvinistic tenets. Two other  
 considerations impelled him to an open declaration  
 of his sentiments: first, he was persuaded that  
 many individuals in the university besides himself  
 revolted from the doctrine of absolute decrees;  
 secondly, he knew that the Belgic confession, to  
 which he had subscribed, had left this point unde-  
 cided. Thus animated and encouraged, he taught  
 with equal freedom and success: but as Calvinism  
 was at this time widely spread throughout Holland,  
 his boldness excited a multitude of enemies. He  
 experienced the most severe marks of disappro-  
 bation and resentment from those who adhered to  
 the theological system of Geneva, and especially  
 from Gomarus, his colleague in the university of  
 Leyden. Arminius lived to see only the begin-  
 ning of that controversy, which involved the re-  
 formed churches in dissension.



CHAP.  
XX.

1609.

England soon participated in these unhappy divisions; and the predestinarian controversy, which had been agitated at the beginning of the reformation, which had continued throughout the reigns of Edward and Mary, was renewed at the conclusion of the reign of Elizabeth. Hitherto the controversy between the church and the puritans had been chiefly about habits and ceremonies, but now it began to open upon points of doctrine, and the church was not so much opposed to the puritans as divided against itself. A large proportion of the exiled divines had embraced the Calvinistic doctrines, and on their return, at the accession of Elizabeth, fearlessly avowed that, by giving up the discipline, they did not intend to depart from the doctrine taught at Geneva. That there was no necessary connexion between them had been proved by some of the Swiss cantons, who were Calvinistic in doctrine while they were Zuinglian in discipline. In England this fact now received additional confirmation; for although all the puritans were Calvinists, both in doctrine and in discipline, yet many doctrinal Calvinists were sincerely attached to episcopacy, and filled with honour and advantage the highest stations in the English church.

It is admitted by all parties that, throughout the former part of Elizabeth's reign, the influence of the Calvinistic doctrines, in the English church, was decidedly preponderant. The Institutes of Calvin were adopted by the universities as a manual of theological instruction, and the honour of Calvin's name gave reputation even to his errors: yet this preponderance by no means amounted to unanimity; and, long before the ap-

pearance of Arminius, there were divines of eminence who thought that a dissent from the Calvinistic scheme was no dereliction of protestantism, nor a departure from the doctrines of the articles of the church of England. A. D. \_\_\_\_\_  
Elizabeth.

Baroe, the Margaret professor of the university of Cambridge, declared strongly against the doctrine of absolute predestination. In a prelection on the warning of the prophet Jonah to the Ninevites, illustrating it by parallel cases in the sacred history, he scrupled not to affirm, that it is the will of God that all mankind should have eternal life, if they believe and persevere in the faith of Christ; but if they do not believe, or fall short in their perseverance, then it is not the will of God that they should be saved\*. 1574.

Harsnet†, ten years afterwards, at the time when he was chaplain to Whitgift, in a sermon at Saint Paul's Cross, inveighed with great warmth against the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation, popular and predominant as the doctrine at that time was. "The opinion," he observed, "is grown high and monstrous, and men shake and tremble under it;" but he feared not to attack it. He grounded his arguments against the doctrine, on its opposition to the general tenor of Scripture, on its making God the author of sin, on its taking from man all freedom of will, and on its inconsistency with the divine attributes. 1584.

When the Arminian scheme was developed in England, it was soon discovered that the strength

\* Baroe, Prælect. 29.

† "He was a man of the greatest parts and learning of his time."—Bishop Warburton.

CHAP.  
XX.

of the Calvinists resided in the university of Cambridge. Among all the antagonists of Arminius, none was esteemed by the foreign professor himself to be more worthy of consideration than Perkins. This divine was educated in Christ's college, where he possessed a fellowship. With respect to his opinions on church government, he was an open favourer of the puritanical discipline, and, on account of his non-conformity, was summoned more than once before the court of high commission; but his peaceable demeanour, his acknowledged learning, and perhaps his high Calvinistic doctrines, procured for him a dispensation from the severities exercised towards many of his non-conforming brethren. In his *Armil*, or *Golden Chain*, the most popular of his numerous works\*, the *Supralapsarian* hypothesis he has set forth without disguise or palliation, careless of the disgust or offence which he might give to the enemies or the moderate friends of the Calvinistic scheme. But Perkins has rendered a service to Calvinism which must not be omitted. While every pen was drawn in maintaining speculative systems of doctrine, few were employed in promoting vital Christianity. Calvin, in the last chapter of his *Institutes*, gave a portraiture of the life and manners of a Christian, but not with the copiousness which the subject required. Perkins filled up the outline which

\* His works are in three volumes folio, and among them is a treatise on witchcraft, in which he believed as firmly as in absolute predestination. His *Armil* has been published in various forms, and translated into various languages. Orton, a dissenting minister, well known for his many useful publications, was a maternal descendant of Perkins. Job Orton's *Letters to a Young Clergyman*, p. 30. 40.

Calvin left unfinished, reduced practical Calvinism into method, and showed its natural effects on Christian morality. A. D.

Elizabeth.

An advocate of doctrinal Calvinism in the university of Cambridge, not more able, but higher in station, than Perkins, was Whitaker. He had signalized himself in a polemical warfare with the most learned Jesuits of his time; he had encountered "the acuteness of Stapleton and the eloquence of Campion," and had entered the lists with that arch-jesuit Bellarmine. But, though a doctrinal Calvinist, Whitaker was an episcopalian; and thus, while Perkins was only tolerated in his fellowship of Christ's college, Whitaker was master of Saint John's college, and held the influential station of regius professor in divinity.

In opposition to the acknowledged sentiments of the governors of the university, there were some individuals sufficiently venturous to proclaim their dissent from the doctrines of Calvin. Barret, a fellow of Caius college, in a Latin sermon delivered before the university, declared his hostility to the Calvinistic doctrines of election and grace, reflecting with great acrimony on the personal character of Calvin, and cautioning his hearers against reading the works of the Genevese reformer. For this sermon Barret was summoned before the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges, and was commanded to make a retractation of his sermon in the church where he delivered it. He complied, but read his retractation in a manner which showed its insincerity, and it was considered as an aggravation of his first offence. So unpopular were both the sermon and the retractation, that several graduates, of different 1595.

CHAP. colleges, signed a petition to the archbishop, pray-  
 XX. ing that the matter might not be suffered to rest,  
 but that the memory of Calvin, and other great  
 names who had been aspersed, might receive some  
 reparation. Barret, not discouraged, joined in the  
 appeal; and Whitgift, at the first hearing of the  
 dispute, condemned the university for its pre-  
 cipitate censure; but the heads of the colleges  
 vindicated their conduct, and insisted on the  
 privileges of the university. The academical de-  
 linquent was summoned to appear at Lambeth  
 before the archbishop and some other divines, and  
 having submitted himself to their examination, his  
 judges decided that some of his opinions were  
 erroneous. They enjoined him to confess his igno-  
 rance and mistake with due contrition; but the  
 temper of Barret revolted at the prescribed hu-  
 miliation, and he prepared to quit the university\*.

The controversy which was at this time com-  
 menced by Barret was not terminated by his con-  
 demnation and departure. The same opinions  
 which Baroe had maintained in his prelections,  
 he published in a sermon before the university.  
 In this discourse he asserted that God created all  
 men according to his own likeness in Adam, and  
 consequently to eternal life, from which no man  
 was rejected but on account of his sins; that Christ  
 died for all mankind, was a propitiation for the  
 sins of the whole world, original and actual; the  
 remedy provided being as extensive as the evil;  
 that the promises of eternal life, made to us in  
 Christ, are to be generally and universally taken

\* Strype's Life of Whitgift, b. 4.

and understood, being made as much to Judas as to Peter.

A. D.  
1596.

Elizabeth

For maintaining these propositions, Baroe was summoned before the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges, who examined him by interrogatories, and having heard his answers, peremptorily commanded him to abstain from publishing such opinions, either in his sermons or lectures. Apprehensive that their censure of Baroe might be thought harsh, they communicated their proceedings to their chancellor Burghley, and justified their condemnation of Baroe's tenets by representing him as inclined to popery. His opinions were contrary to those which had prevailed in the university since the accession of the queen; and they expressed a fear, that if such novelties were not suppressed, the whole body of popery might be forced upon them: they therefore earnestly besought their chancellor to join them in opposing such doctrines.

On the other hand, Baroe wrote, not to the chancellor of the university, but to the archbishop; and, without entering into a defence of his opinions, gave a promise not to publish them in future, and to join in preserving the peace of the university by dropping the controversy in silence\*. He next addressed Burghley, praying him to stay any further proceedings of the vice chancellor, and, in acceding to this petition, Burghley concurred with Whitgift. On the merits of the question, and on the conduct of the university towards Baroe, these eminent men were divided. Whitgift coincided with the university, and Burghley inclined to Baroe.

\* Strype's Life of Whitgift, b. 4.

CHAP.  
XX.

The chancellor, in his letter to the university, expressed his indignation at the conduct of that body over which he presided, and scrupled not to ascribe the late persecution of Baroe to envy or hatred\*.

In order to terminate the dispute with honour to themselves, the heads of the university, declining any farther appeal to their chancellor, deputed two of their body† to repair to Lambeth. The object of their mission was, to consult with the archbishop, assisted by some other prelates and divines, on the formation of certain articles on the controverted points; and to propose that a conformity to these articles might be required, in order to secure the peace of the university.

Whitgift having associated with himself the bishop of London‡, the bishop elect of Bangor, and some others, a consultation took place with the divines of Cambridge; and the result of their deliberations was an agreement on the following propositions, afterwards known under the title of the LAMBETH ARTICLES.

Nov. 20.

1. God from all eternity has predestinated some persons to life, and others to death. 2. The moving or efficient cause of predestination to life is not foreseen faith, or perseverance in good works, or any other quality, in the persons predestinated, but the sole will and pleasure of God. 3. The number

\* "You have sifted him with interrogatories, as if he were a thief: this seems done of stomach among you." Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, b. 4.

† Whitaker and Tyndal.

‡ Fletcher. Fuller, in his *Church History*, has made Bancroft bishop of London at this time, in which error he is followed by Wilkins in his *Concilia*. The mistake of Fuller was noticed and corrected by Heylin.

of the predestinated is predetermined and certain, and cannot be increased or lessened. 4. Those who are not predestinated to salvation are necessarily condemned on account of their sins. 5. A true, lively, and justifying faith, and the sanctifying influence of the Spirit of God, is not extinguished, neither does it fail, nor does it vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally. 6. A man who is truly faithful, or endowed with justifying faith, has a certain and full assurance of the remission of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ. 7. Saving grace is not afforded to all men, neither have all men such a communication of the divine assistance, that they may be saved if they will. 8. No man can come to Christ unless it be granted to him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father that they may come to Christ. 9. It is not in the will and power of every man to be saved\*.

A. D.

Elizabeth.

Before these propositions were agreed on at Lambeth, they were transmitted by Whitgift to Hutton, archbishop of York, soliciting his opinion on them, and acquainting him with the animosities prevailing at Cambridge. Hutton, in his reply, while he lamented that dissensions on such points should ever have been raised, appeared to impute the blame to the anti-calvinists. It was his original intention to have offered his sentiments at length on each of the articles; but fearing that he might exasperate some persons for whom he entertained a sincere respect and affection, he was contented

October 1.

\* Fuller's Church History, b. 9, and Collier's Ecclesiast. Hist. b. 6.



CHAP.  
XX.

---

to deliver his opinion briefly on the points of election and reprobation. He reminded Whitgift that, while they were both at the university of Cambridge, there was no disagreement between them in religious matters\*.

It is probable that, as soon as these articles were settled, they were communicated to Burghley, before they were submitted to the queen. Whitaker thought it an indispensable duty to ask a personal conference with the chancellor of Cambridge, at which he presented a copy of the articles, together with a sermon preached by himself. Though oppressed by bodily infirmity, Burghley retained his vigour of mind and soundness of judgment, and did not shrink from an argument, even with Whitaker, on a question of theology. With great freedom he signified his disapprobation of the articles in general, and especially that on predestination. He entered into a long discussion on this point, and to his forcible reasoning Whitaker was either unable or unwilling to offer a reply. These two great men parted, never to meet again; for Whitaker died shortly after his return to Cambridge.

When the articles were exhibited to the queen, she expressed her dissatisfaction more strongly even than Burghley. The Calvinists have insinuated that she agreed in their substance; but the advocates of predestination will gain little by enlisting Elizabeth under their banners. But her displeasure was unequivocally shown, because they were framed without her authority, and even with-

\* Fuller's Church History, b. 9. Hutton had been formerly master of Pembroke-hall, and regius professor of divinity.

out her knowledge, and because such unfathomable mysteries were imposed as articles of faith. Sir Robert Cecil, one of her secretaries, communicated these sentiments of his sovereign to Whitgift, and the archbishop enjoined the vice-chancellor of Cambridge to use his own discretion with respect to the publication of the articles, since they were not well received by the court or by the queen herself\*.

A. D.

Elizabeth.

It has been doubted whether Whitgift himself really believed in these propositions, or whether he agreed to them, in deference to the judgment of Whitaker, and with a view to subdue the animosities at Cambridge†. To rescue a man so deservedly revered by the church of England as Whitgift, from an imputation which affects his integrity, is the duty of every member of that church. If Whitgift believed in these articles, hard of belief as they may appear to some, he believed them in common with many other “burning and shining lights of our church in her early days, long since gone to the resting-place of the spirits of the just‡;” in common with men, by a comparison with whom even Whitgift might be injured. Viewing him as a high doctrinal Calvinist, the Arminian may apostrophize him: “Such as thou art, would that thou couldst be ours!” Viewing him in any other light, both Calvinist and Arminian must reject him with indignation, or receive him with contempt. The Arminian cause needs not such a defender, and it needs not dread Whitgift as an antagonist.

\* Strype's Life of Whitgift, b. 4.

† Heylin's History of Presbytery, b. 10.

‡ Bishop Horsley's Charge, 1806.

CHAP.  
XX.

---

Conscientiously believing in these articles as Whitgift believed, it may still be presumed, that his unbiassed judgment would not have dictated their imposition, either on the church of England or the university of Cambridge, as articles of peace. They could have been framed only by a violent partisan of the supralapsarian hypothesis, and, like all other intemperate measures, injured the cause which they were designed to support. The voluntary and honourable retirement of Baroe from the theatre of contention advanced his character and promoted his opinions, while the inclination of the queen and her government to Arminianism was unequivocally expressed in the appointment of a successor to Whitaker. Overal  
1596. was selected to fill the regius professorship, whose profound erudition and controversial prowess commanded the admiration of the Arminians and the awe of the Calvinists.

Having related the origin of that controversy which, by dividing the English church against itself, contributed to its overthrow, it is proper to state, that its ruin was retarded by similar divisions among its enemies. Nothing like union had ever subsisted between the sects of puritanism; but a schism now took place between the hitherto united Romanists. While cardinal Allen lived, his prudence had composed the animosities between the  
1594. secular priests and the Jesuits; but after his death their enmity was undisguised, and almost unrestrained. The seculars were chiefly natives of England, and professed their allegiance in the most ample terms to Elizabeth, acknowledging the clemency of her government, and their ob-

ligations to devote their lives and properties to its maintenance. The writers on their side proved against the Jesuits that, during] the first eleven years of this reign, not a single Romanist was capitally prosecuted for his religion; and that, in the next ten years, under the provocation of the bull of excommunication by Pius the Fifth, and the rebellion of the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, there were not more than twelve priests executed, and even some of these were convicted of treasonable practices. It was not till after the first mission of the Jesuits into England that any severities were exercised against members of the Romish religion. To Parsons the Jesuit they attributed the foundation of English seminaries in Spain, to him they also attributed the Spanish invasion of England and Ireland. They argued that religious truth was not to be propagated by rebellion, and they cautioned the English papists against sending their children to any of the jesuitical seminaries.

A. D.

Elizabeth.

1580.

These professions of loyalty were credited by Bancroft, then bishop of London; and he afforded his countenance to the seculars, in spite of puritanical censure: but this semblance of zeal for a protestant government was not so readily trusted by Elizabeth and her council. A proclamation was published, commanding the Jesuits, and those secular priests who joined them, to quit the kingdom, and that, if they presumed to return, they might expect to suffer the extremity of the law\*.

The close of Elizabeth's reign affords little

1602.

\* Camden's Elizabeth

CHAP.  
XX.

matter for ecclesiastical history. There was a temporary cessation of hostility between the church and the puritans\*, and both puritans and papists were anxiously looking forward to a change of policy by the demise of the crown. The last days of the queen were clouded by domestic afflictions, but not by any convulsions in the state, or by any national reverses. Her lofty spirit was subdued, partly by the ingratitude of the earl of Essex, and partly by seeing herself the object of comparative indifference and neglect. Of all her counsellors, Whitgift alone remained, to cheer the gloom of her declining years. Providence had spared him, to be the chief consolation of her life, as well as the instrument of its preservation; he was also spared "to be the greatest comfort of her soul upon her death-bed, to be present at the expiration of her last breath, and to behold the closing of those eyes that had long looked upon him with reverence and affection †."

1601.  
Feb. 25.

1603.  
March 24.

Among the weaknesses of Elizabeth was that of refusing to appoint her successor; a measure which was incumbent, from every motive of policy and conscience. Arguments of policy had been urged by the house of commons, arguments addressed to the conscience had been sometimes urged by the spiritual advisers of the queen. Hutton, archbishop of York, had the courage to press this delicate point of fixing the succession, in a sermon before Elizabeth, at Whitehall. He even told her that Nero was hated on no account more than for

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. c. 8.

† Isaac Walton's Life of Hooker.

wishing to have no successor ; and that Augustus lost much of public esteem for appointing a bad one ; and he intimated that the eyes of the nation were turned upon the king of Spain, as the prince who, from proximity of blood, might reasonably expect to ascend the English throne\*.

A. D.  
1603.

Elizabeth.

Elizabeth was left to decide between the king of Spain and the king of Scotland, the one a papist and the other a presbyterian, and both hostile to the English church ; but the decision was protracted to her dying moments, when the lord-keeper and the secretary Cecil waited on her, by direction of the privy council. Her last act of interference with the concerns of this world was to signify her pleasure that the king of Scots, her nearest relation, should succeed her†.

As the accession of James is the era of the union between the two kingdoms, it is necessary to state briefly the condition of the Scottish church at this period. Through the preaching of John Knox, Scotland, while governed by a sovereign of the Romish communion, had renounced the authority of the see of Rome, and had submitted to the discipline of Geneva. A few years after the return of this celebrated reformer to his native country, the general assembly of the Scottish church had approved the presbyterian form of church government ; but the vote of the assembly was not confirmed by the Scottish parliament. The bishops were not formally deprived either of their revenues or their authority, though all ecclesiastical affairs

1566.

\* Sir John Harington's Brief View of the State of the Church of England, p. 188.

† Camden's Elizabeth.

- CHAP. XX.
- 
1574. were virtually managed by provincial presbyteries and the general assembly. The assembly had passed a vote against diocesan episcopacy, and had resolved that bishops were originally only superintendents of a single parish. Having advanced thus far, it was afterwards voted that prelates should lay down their titles, and be addressed by their proper names, and in the succeeding year the name of a bishop was voted to be a grievance.
1577. Two years afterwards, the general assembly unanimously declared diocesan episcopacy to be unscriptural and unlawful. During his minority, James the Sixth, and the other members of his family, were obliged to subscribe a confession of faith, with a solemn league and covenant annexed, by which they engaged to maintain and defend the protestant doctrine and the presbyterian discipline.
1580. The bishops were indeed restored by the Scottish parliament to a portion of that dignity of which they had been deprived by the general assembly; for it was there enacted, that to procure the abolition or diminution of the authority of either of the three estates of the realm was an act of high treason. But when this statute was proclaimed, the ministers of religion protested against it, as not having received the sanction of the kirk.
1587. When James had arrived at full age, he consented to an act, taking away all the lands once belonging to the bishops, and annexing them to the crown; and subsequently all acts of parliament whatsoever, in favour of popery or episcopacy, were annulled. All presentations to benefices were directed to their respective presbyteries, who were invested with full power to give institution or col-

lation. This act was confirmed by two successive parliaments, so that when James ascended the throne of England, presbyterianism was the legal establishment of his Scottish dominions\*.

A. D.  
1603.  
James I.

The insincerity of James in his attachment to the presbyterian discipline can be no longer doubtful. His professions of attachment have been carefully recorded, and perhaps magnified by those who were incensed at his change of conduct, and those are the only historians of his earlier years†. It has been stated that, on a particular occasion, standing up in the general assembly convened at Edinburgh, with uncovered head and uplifted hands, he praised God that he was born in the time of the light of the gospel, and in such a place, as to be king of such a church, the sincerest kirk in the world. "The church of Geneva," he said, "keep Pasche and Yule‡: what have they for them? They have no institution. As for our neighbour kirk of England, their service is an evil-said mass in English; they want nothing of the mass but its liftings. I charge you, my good ministers, doctors, elders, noblemen, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same." In his speech to his parliament, not long before the death of Elizabeth, he assured the estates that he had no intention to introduce papistical or Anglican bishops. And finally, when he left his native country, to take possession of the crown of England, he gave public thanks to God, in the kirk of Edinburgh, that he

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 1.

† Calderwood's History of the Church of Scotland.

‡ Easter and Christmas.



---

**CHAP.  
XX.**

left both kirk and kingdom in that state which he never intended to alter while his subjects lived in peace.

The parentage of James being of the Romish faith, and the spontaneous declarations of his mature years being in favour of the presbyterian discipline, the hopes of the English puritans and papists were raised, and those of the friends of protestant episcopacy were proportionably depressed. As soon as Elizabeth was dead, Whitgift, unceasingly watchful for the safety of the church, sent Nevil, the dean of Canterbury, into Scotland, to give assurances of the unfeigned duty and loyalty of the English church to its new sovereign, and to recommend it to his countenance and protection. The king answered briefly but decisively, that he would uphold the government of the church as the queen had left it.

In the interval which elapsed between the accession of James and his arrival in England, amidst their hopes, all parties had their fears, but all were ready to lay before him their grievances and their wishes. The papists reminded him that he was born of catholic parents; that he had been baptized according to the rites of the church of Rome; that his mother, of whom he always spoke with reverence, was a martyr for the catholic faith; and that he himself, on various occasions, had expressed no dislike to the Romish doctrines, though he disallowed the usurpations of the Romish see; and, under these circumstances, they welcomed him with assurances of their allegiance, and with a petition for an open toleration.

The Dutch and French churches, which had en-

joyed under Elizabeth their peculiar rites and discipline, addressed James for a continuance of their privileges. The king replied, that many words were unnecessary to assure them of his good will; he respected their confidence in selecting his dominions as a religious sanctuary, and promised that if their assemblies were disturbed, he would avenge their cause as if they were his natural subjects.

A. D.  
1603.

James I.

While the king was in his progress towards the metropolis of his new kingdom, the puritans presented their millenary petition, so called because it was said to be subscribed by a thousand hands. Its title was imposing, but it conveyed a fallacy, and its substance was not less false than its title\*. The subscribers thought it fit to style themselves ministers of the church of England, and professed that, "neither as factious men, affecting a popular parity in the church, nor as schismatics, aiming at the dissolution of the ecclesiastical state, but as the faithful ministers of Christ, and loyal subjects to the king, they humbly desired the redress of some abuses." And although many of them had formerly subscribed their assent to the liturgy, some upon a protestation, others on an explanation, and others upon conditional terms; yet now they groaned under the burden of human rites and ceremonies, and with one consent threw themselves at the feet of the king for relief.

April.

Their grievances were divided under four heads: first, of the liturgy, containing a repetition of all the puritanical objections; secondly, of the articles,

\* It was subscribed by not more than eight hundred out of twenty-five counties. Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 1.

CHAP.  
XX.

---

from which they solicited a release of subscription ; thirdly, of church property, being a condemnation of pluralities and lay impropriations ; and lastly, of church discipline, being a complaint of the ecclesiastical courts. These grievances, they alleged, were not agreeable to the word of God, and they humbly desired that they might be permitted to prove the truth of their allegation, either in disputation, writing, or conference.

No sooner was this attack made on the privileges and discipline of the church, than it was repelled by the two universities. These learned bodies expressed their disapprobation at the conduct of the millenary subscribers, though in a different manner. The university of Cambridge passed a decree in its senate, that if any of its members publicly impugned the doctrine and discipline of the church of England, he should be suspended from any degree which he had already taken, and be disabled from taking any degree in future. The university of Oxford published an answer to the millenary petition, dedicated to the king, with a preface addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury, the chancellors of both universities, and the two secretaries of state. The answer, in terms of just severity, reproached the petitioners with having first subscribed, and with afterwards having solicited a release from their subscription. It commended the episcopal form of government, as the best support of the monarchy, and the best for the promotion of theological learning. It averred that there were more learned men in England than could be found in all the other protestant churches of Europe\*.

\* Strype's Annals, vol. iv.

The divines of Cambridge transmitted to their brethren of Oxford a letter of thanks for this reasonable vindication of the ecclesiastical establishment, highly commending its weighty arguments, and, in allusion to the boasted numbers of the puritans, observed, "If Saul has his thousands, David has his ten thousands." They intimated to the sister university their own decree; and in reply to that part of the petition which invited a disputation, said, "Let these puritans answer our almost a thousand books in defence of the hierarchy, before they presume to dispute before so learned and wise a king."

A. D.  
1603.

---

James I.

When James had approached London as near as Theobalds, Whitgift requested an audience, and received from the king his assurances of protection of the church of England. The archbishop then with alacrity prepared himself to perform the duties of his station at the coronation, and the august solemnity was celebrated in the collegiate church of Westminster. July 25

The puritans having renewed their importunities, if not for a redress, yet at least for a calm discussion of their grievances, neither the king nor the prelates were indisposed to grant their request. Whitgift, though advanced in age, and declining in strength, remitted nothing of his characteristic activity. Not a pamphlet nor a petition escaped his vigilance, or escaped without an answer\*.

\* In one of his letters to Cecil, afterwards earl of Shrewsbury, Whitgift observed: "Though our humorous and contentious brethren have made many petitions and motions correspondent to their nature, yet, to my comfort, they have not much prevailed. You cannot imagine that I have been all

CHAP.  
XX.

To deprive the puritans of all reasonable cause of complaint, the king agreed to the conference which they had so earnestly solicited, and issued a proclamation for its meeting. As to his own persuasion, he declared that the constitution of the church of England was agreeable to the word of God, and the practice of the primitive church : yet, because he had received information that there were some things in it which gave offence and scandal, he had appointed a meeting of divers bishops and other learned men, at which he intended to be present. In the mean time, he commanded his subjects to forbear from presenting petitions, for he was determined to preserve the church in such a form as he had found it established by law, and he would consent only to rectify such abuses as he found to be manifestly proved.

The place appointed for this conference was the palace at Hampton-court, and the disputants on each side were nominated by the king \*. On the part of the church were nine bishops, two alone of whom appear to have taken a prominent part in the debate, and these two were Whitgift and Bancroft. Several inferior dignitaries were joined with the bishops, among whom are recorded the names of Andrews, Overal, Barlow, and Bridges; divines

this while idle, nor greatly quiet in my mind: for who can promise himself rest among so many vipers?"

\* An account of the conference was published by Barlow, dean of Chester. It is printed in the first volume of the *Phoenix*. Other accounts have been published by the puritanical party, particularly by Patrick Galloway, a Scotsman. See Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, Appendix to b. iv. No. 45, which contains a letter from the bishop of Durham to the archbishop of York.

who had been already known by their writings in defence of the hierarchy, or who, by their subsequent labours in the same cause, justified the propriety of their selection on this occasion. On the part of the puritans, only four of their ministers appeared, although more had been summoned, and two came from each university\*. The divines of the church wore the habits of their respective orders; but the puritanical ministers, with their accustomed contempt of established ordinances and external propriety, were habited like Turkey merchants.

A. D.  
1604.

James I.

The conference continued during three days, on the first of which the bishops and other divines of the church alone were present, together with a numerous crowd of courtiers, and the lords of the privy council. The king opened the business of the day with a speech in commendation of the English hierarchy, and he congratulated himself that he was now come into the promised land, that he sat among grave and reverend men, and that he was not now, as formerly, a king without state, nor in a place where beardless boys might brave him to the face. He assured the assembly that he had not convened it from any desire of innovation, for he acknowledged the ecclesiastical state, as it was already established, to be approved by manifold blessings from God himself. But since he had received complaints of irregularities and abuses in the church, he was willing to remove them, if scandalous, and to take them into consideration,

Jan. 14.  
16. 18.

\* Dr. John Reynolds and Dr. Thomas Sparke, from Oxford; Mr. Chadderton and Mr. Knewstubbs from Cambridge.

CHAP.  
XX.

---

even if trivial. The main reason of his holding a separate consultation with the prelates and divines of the church was to receive satisfaction from themselves on three points : first, on the objections against the book of common prayer ; secondly, on the abuses of the ecclesiastical courts ; and, thirdly, on the religious state of Ireland. If on either of these points there should be any grievances fit to be redressed, it might be done of their own pure suggestion, without being driven to redress abuses by the arguments of their opponents.

The objections against the common prayer book related to the rite of confirmation, which had been represented to the king to imply a second baptism ; but the archbishop, on his knees, explained, that the church did not hold baptism to be incomplete without confirmation. Bancroft said, that the rite itself was of apostolical practice, if not of apostolical institution, and that it was called in scripture the rite of "laying on of hands." But, to satisfy the scruples of the puritans, it was agreed that to the title of confirmation should be added the words, "and examination of children."

The king, in the next place, excepted to the absolution pronounced in the daily service, as having too great a resemblance to the church of Rome ; but the archbishop completely vindicated the practice of the English church from the charge. Bancroft defended not only the absolution in the daily service, but that in the office of the communion and visitation of the sick ; adding, that "similar forms were retained by the confessions of Augsburg, Bohemia, and Saxony ; and that Calvin himself had approved such a general confession and

absolution as was used by the English church." The conclusion was, that in a future consultation it should be determined whether the words "remission of sins" should not be added to the absolution in the rubric.

A. D.  
1604.

James I.

Another objection offered by the king was against private baptism, and baptism by women. It had been customary in the church of Rome, and the custom was not formally abolished, nor entirely discontinued, in England after the reformation, to license midwives for the performance of the sacrament of baptism in cases of necessity. An oath was taken for the due performance of the sacrament; and the baptism, when performed, was to be certified to the curate of the parish. The archbishop assured the king, that although the practice of lay baptism had not been abolished formally, yet it was scarcely ever used in the church of England. Others said, that lay baptism was a reasonable practice, the minister not being essential to the sacrament. But the king not being satisfied, it was referred to consideration, whether the word "curate," or "lawful minister," should not be inserted in the office for private baptism.

The king proceeding to the second head of conference, the abuses of the ecclesiastical courts, it was agreed, that for light offences the name of excommunication should be changed, though the same censure should be retained, or an equivalent substituted.

These were all the alterations agreed on between the king and the bishops on the first day of the conference; for the religious state of Ireland was not discussed. The result of this day's debate was



CHAP.  
XX.

reported by a presbyterian minister\* to the presbytery of Edinburgh, in a manner very unfavourable to the bishops. According to his statement, the king commanded them, as they would answer it to God on their consciences, and to himself on their allegiance, to advise among themselves concerning the corruptions of the church. The bishops reported that all was well; and when the king, with great earnestness, adduced many defects and abuses, they prayed the king, on their knees, that no alterations might take place. It is not improbable that this presbyterian minister might have exhibited the doubts and objections of the king in a different light from that which was intended by James himself. He might have placed the objections of the puritans in the strongest point of view, and have clothed them in the most offensive garb, to see whether they could be answered. Andrews, afterward bishop of Winchester, penetrated into the motive of James; for he said that, on the first day, the king "during five hours did wonderfully play the puritan."

On the second day of the conference the four presbyterian ministers, with Alexander Galloway, a minister of Perth, were introduced into the royal presence to sustain the cause of the puritans. On the side of the church, a selection was made of two bishops, and about six other divines, the rest being secluded, that the puritans might not be overpowered by numbers. The king being seated, with his courtiers and privy counsellors standing around him, informed the non-conforming mini-

\* Patrick Galloway.

sters that he was prepared to hear their objections against the ecclesiastical establishment.

A. D.  
1604.

James I.

Of these puritan divines, it would be malignant praise to say that Reynolds was the most able, for he was reputed to be the greatest scholar of his age and country. He was one of two brothers who had mutually converted each other\*, and in polemical theology was esteemed fully equal to contend with Bellarmine, the Goliath of the church of Rome. Wonders are related of his extensive reading, and of his vast memory. Such was the man who stood before James, to propound and enforce the scruples of the puritans.

In the name of his brethren, Reynolds humbly requested, 1. that the doctrines of the church might be preserved in purity; 2. that good pastors might be planted in all churches to preach the same; 3. that the book of common prayer might be fitted to more increase of piety; 4. that church government might be sincerely administered according to God's word.

1. Whatever objections the puritans might have hitherto entertained against the discipline and liturgy of the church, yet they always admitted its doctrines to be scriptural. That there was no difference in point of doctrine between the puritans and conformists is the confession of their own historian. But now, for the first time, they ex-

\* William, the other brother, died in 1594, and published many tracts in defence of the Romish religion; John, the subject of the present narrative, was president of Corpus Christi college in Oxford. These three eminent divines, viz. Jewel, Hooker, and Reynolds, were all of this college, and all of the same county, Devon. John Reynolds died in 1607.

CHAP.  
XX.

pressed a wish to model the doctrinal articles. The episcopalian Calvinists had already shown their dissatisfaction at the articles, by their attempt to establish the Lambeth articles on predestination and absolute decrees; but they had not as yet testified a design of altering the established confession of faith. The puritan ministers went one step further, for they desired not only that the Lambeth articles might be added to the thirty-nine, but that some of these thirty-nine might be altered.

In the sixteenth article it is said, that “after we have received the Holy Ghost we may fall from grace.” Reynolds very naturally imagined that this passage was adverse to the Calvinistic doctrine of the perseverance of the elect; and therefore requested that the words, “yet neither totally nor finally,” might be added by way of explanation.

Bancroft was ready with an answer, and observed, that “very many in those days, neglecting holiness of life, presumed too much on persisting in grace, laying all their religion on predestination. ‘If I shall be saved, I shall be saved,’ was a desperate doctrine, contrary to sound theology and the true doctrine of predestination. We should rather arrive at predestination by an ascending than a descending ratio. We should argue thus: ‘I live in obedience to God, in love with my neighbour, I follow my vocation, therefore I trust God hath elected me, and predestinated me to salvation.’ Not thus: ‘God hath predestinated me to life; therefore, though I sin never so grievously, I shall not be damned; for whom he loveth, he loveth unto the end.’” Whereupon he showed the king, out of the seventeenth

article, what was the doctrine of the church of England concerning predestination in the very last paragraph; namely, "We must receive the promises of God as they are generally set forth to us in the holy Scriptures; and in our doings, that the will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the word of God."

A. D.  
1604.  
James I.

The royal moderator, whatever might be his private opinion on these abstruse points, approved the reference made by Bancroft; he farther refused to admit the Lambeth articles into a public confession of faith, or to introduce into any public formulary such theological niceties; because, on such abstruse points, there will always be a difference and a contrariety of opinion.

An exception was also taken by Reynolds to the twenty-third article, that "it is unlawful for any one to take upon himself the office of preaching or administering the sacraments in the congregation before he is lawfully called." He moved that the words "in the congregation" be omitted, as if they implied a licence to perform these functions out of the congregation without a lawful call. He also objected an inconsistency between the twenty-fifth article and the collects of confirmation, and insinuated that the solemnity might be performed by a priest. But after hearing Bancroft, the king gave his opinion that it ought to be performed by a bishop, and closed his remarks with his favourite maxim, "No bishop, no king."

After some interruption Reynolds proceeded, and desired a new catechism, that in the common prayer-book being too short, and that of Nowell being too long. To this suggestion the king con-

---

CHAP.  
XX.

sented, provided that all curious and abstruse questions might be avoided in teaching the rudimental principles of Christianity, and that our agreement with the papists in some points might not be esteemed heterodoxy. Reynolds further desired a new translation of the Bible; to which the king agreed, on condition that there were no marginal notes, observing, that of all translations, the Genevan was the worst, since it justified rebellion against kings.

Reynolds next complained of the publication of seditious books, particularly those written by papists; a complaint which called forth a reply from Bancroft, against whom it was principally directed. The king also vindicated Bancroft, desiring Reynolds to acquaint his party that the bishop had been misrepresented and injured, and that his conduct was worthy of commendation. By his management the breach had been widened between the jesuits and the seculars, to the prejudice of the Romish religion. Cecil added, that these books had rendered an essential service to the English government, that they confuted the pretensions of the king of Spain to the English crown, and exculpated the late queen and her ministers from the imputation of executing papists purely on account of their religion. "Doctor," determined the king, "you are a better college man than a statesman."

2. Having prayed that some remedy might be provided against the profanation of the Lord's day, Reynolds went on to the second head. He complained of pluralities, and prayed that all parishes might be supplied with preaching ministers. Bancroft petitioned that all parishes might have a

praying ministry, since preaching was so much in fashion that the worship of God was neglected. Pulpit harangues were often dangerous; and therefore he humbly moved that the number of homilies might be increased, and that the clergy might be obliged to read them, instead of their own crude or splenetic compositions. The puritan ministers replied, on being required to give an opinion, that a preaching ministry was most useful, though they allowed that, when preachers could not be obtained, godly prayers, homilies, and exhortations might be productive of good. Some jocularities passed on the subject of pluralities, but the debate was closed by the king, who promised to refer the matter to the bishops.

A. D.  
1604.  
James I.

3. The objections of the puritans comprehended under the third head were numerous. Reynolds complained of the late articles imposed by Whitgift, in consequence of which imposition many clergymen were deprived, though they were willing to subscribe the doctrinal articles of the church, to acknowledge the king's supremacy, and to obey the statutes of the realm. He excepted also to reading the apocryphal books in the public service, to the interrogatories and the sign of the cross in baptism, to the surplice and the other habits, to the ring in the service of marriage, and to the churching of women under the title of purification. Those things, he said, were relics of popery; they had been abused to purposes of idolatry, and therefore ought to be abolished.

Here the king interposed, and said, that the surplice was a comely garment, and that the cross was as old as Constantine: it was not more a su-

CHAP.  
XX.

perstitious sign than the imposition of hands, which the puritans allowed to be of apostolic institution. As for the other exceptions, they were capable of a satisfactory explanation. "But," continued the king, "as to the power of the church in things indifferent, I will not argue that point with you, but answer as the sovereign answers his parliament, *Le roi s'avisera*. Your objections are like those of a beardless boy, who told me, at a late conference in Scotland, that he would hold conformity with me in doctrine, but that, as to ceremonies, every man ought to be left at liberty. But I will have none of that: I will have one doctrine, one religion in substance and ceremony: never speak to that point again, how far you are bound to obey."

4. Reynolds was going on to complain of excommunication by lay-chancellors; but the king having said that he should consult the bishops on this head, the puritan divine further desired, that the clergy might be permitted to hold assemblies at stated periods; that in rural deaneries there might be a liberty of holding prophesyings; that those cases which could not be resolved there, might be referred to the archdeacon at his visitation, and thence to a diocesan synod. At this the king could no longer contain his indignation, but told the puritan ministers that he now saw through their intentions; they were aiming at a Scottish presbytery, which agreed as well with monarchy as God and the devil. He continued in a strain of coarse invective \*, and then turning to the bishops,

\* "Sancho Pancha never made a better speech, nor more to the purpose, during his government." Bishop Warburton.

he said, "My lords, I may thank you that the puritans plead for my supremacy; for if once you were out, and they were in place, I know what would become of my supremacy; for, no bishop, no king." Having asked Reynolds if he had any thing more to offer, and being answered in the negative, he terminated the debate in the following manner: "If this be all that your party have to say, I will make them conform, or I will hurry them out of the land, or else worse."

A. D.  
1604.  
James I.

Thus ended the conference of the second day, to the complete satisfaction of no one present but the king. Reynolds was thought by the puritans to have fallen below himself\*, and, consequently, lost some of his estimation. But the puritan ministers were insulted and ridiculed, and the ill-timed levity of James was directed against the bishops as well as the non-conformists. The courtiers followed at a due distance the example of their royal master. One of them said, that a puritan was a protestant frightened out of his senses; another, that the puritan ministers looked more like Turks than Christians, as might be seen by their habits. The bishops have been accused of flattering the wisdom and learning of the king, not only calling him the Solomon of the age, but saying that he was undoubtedly specially illuminated by the Spirit of God. The other courtiers were not behind the bishops in the language of adulation, for the lord-chancellor exclaimed that he had never seen the king and the priest so fully united in the same person.

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 1.



---

**CHAP.  
XX.**

At the conference on the third day, the bishops and other divines of the church, together with some civilians, were called into the council-chamber, to satisfy the king's scruples concerning the court of high commission. A committee was also appointed to consider the religious wants of Ireland and the Scottish borders. After this, Reynolds and his brethren were summoned for the last time, not to debate, but to hear the alterations in the book of common prayer which it had been resolved to adopt.

These not satisfying the expectations of the puritan ministers, one of them fell on his knees, and prayed that the surplice and the cross might not be pressed on some godly ministers of Lancashire; another solicited the same favour for some equally godly ministers in Suffolk. The bishops were about to oppose this concession, when the king, with a stern voice, thus interposed: "We have taken pains here to conclude in a resolution for uniformity, and you will undo all by preferring the credit of a few private men to the peace of the church. This is the Scottish way, but I will have none of this arguing; therefore let them conform, and that quickly, or else they that are of an obstinate and turbulent spirit, I will have them enforced to conformity."

A short time after the conference, a proclamation from the king showed that he adhered to his resolution. He therein stated, that though the doctrine and discipline of the church were unexceptionable, and agreeable to primitive antiquity, yet he had graciously submitted to hear the objections of the non-conformists. Those objections he had found to be very slender, but a few had

been allowed. Therefore he commanded all his loving subjects to conform to the liturgy, as the only established form to be tolerated within the realm, and admonished them not to expect any further concessions, or to shake his resolution.

A. D.  
1604.

James I.

The conference at Hampton-court was soon followed by the death of Whitgift; and a contemporary author of high credit has suggested that his death was hastened by his fears. He dreaded the meeting of the approaching parliament, and suspected that the king was inclined to sanction puritanical innovations. Yet this conjecture appears to be inadmissible: Whitgift could have no reason to be dissatisfied with the result of the conference, and he might have there seen enough of James's arbitrary temper not to be alarmed at the interference or opposition of any parliament assembled under such a monarch. With truly Christian humility, the venerable primate expressed his thankfulness that he was summoned to render an account of his bishopric to God, rather than permitted to exercise it any longer among men\*. The loss of such a governor of the church at the commencement of a new dynasty was severely felt, and by none more sensibly than by the king. The afflicted monarch endeavoured to console, not his dying servant, but himself, and said that he would pray earnestly to God for the recovery of one so eminently useful, a boon which, if granted, would be one of the greatest temporal blessings that could

Feb. 29.

\* "Et nunc, Domine, exaltata est anima mea, quod in eo tempore succubui, quando mallem episcopatus mei reddere rationem, quam inter homines exercere." Camden.

**CHAP.** be conferred on the kingdom. The authority which  
**XX.** must be received with hesitation as to the cause of  
Whitgift's death, will be readily accepted in attestation of his excellence, that he had devoutly consecrated his whole life to God, and his painful labours to the church \*.

\* Camden, Britan. Com. Cant.

## CHAPTER XXI.

Meeting of Parliament.—Speech of the King.—Canons of 1604.—Succession of Bancroft to the Primacy.—Gunpowder Plot.—Oath of Allegiance.—Controversy on the Lawfulness of the Oath.—Supplement to the Catechism.—New Translation of the Bible.—Attempt of James to re-establish Episcopacy in Scotland.—Death of Bancroft.—Succession of Abbot.

THE first parliament of James was opened with a speech declaratory of the conduct which he intended to pursue towards the two different classes of non-conformists within his dominions. Before the parliament met he had renewed the proclamation of Elizabeth, commanding all jesuits and Romish priests to leave the kingdom; but he professed that his adoption of this apparently severe measure arose not from hatred to the religion, but to the policy of the Romish see: it was adopted because the professors of that religion maintained the pope's temporal power over princes. Another proclamation was issued against the puritans, in which there was no indulgence for tender consciences; all must conform, or suffer the penalties of the law.

In his speech to his parliament, James acquainted that body, that, at his coming into England, he found three different ways of worshipping God, professed: the first was the religion established by law, which was now his own; the second was that of the Roman catholics; and the third

A. D.  
1604.

James I.  
March 19.

CHAP.  
XXI.

was that of the puritans. This last party, commonly termed Novellists, he regarded rather as a sect than a society of Christians, and notwithstanding their difference from the established church on points of doctrine was not great, yet their political principles were scarcely to be endured in a well-regulated commonwealth.

Enlarging on that part of his subject which related to the papists, he acknowledged that he was educated in the reformed religion, and mature inquiry had confirmed his preference of the protestant faith; but he disclaimed all bigotry towards those of the ancient communion. "I should be sorry," said the king, "to make my private conscience the measure of belief to all my subjects." He divided the Romanists into two classes, the priesthood and the laity. Of these he thought the laity the most excusable, on account of the profound submission and implicit belief required by the church. It was his ardent wish that he might be the instrument of uniting the two religions; and of an event so desirable there might be some hope, if the Romanists would renounce the supremacy of the pope, his right to dispose of crowns and sceptres, and to dethrone kings. But he cautioned the English Romanists not to presume too far upon his lenity, nor to entertain the visionary hope of gaining an establishment for their religion. That he should ever countenance or connive even at its dissemination could not be expected, on three accounts: first, such an indulgence was contrary to his own conscience; secondly, it could not be granted without an excessive relaxation of the rights and liberties of the island; and, thirdly, the

crown would be conveyed to his posterity in a worse condition than he found it\*.

A. D.  
1604.

---

James I.

That James was not willing to govern by a free parliament was soon evident; for he assumed the right of dictating and controlling the choice of the national representatives. His consent was an indispensable requisite to their admission into the house, and disputed elections were examined and decided in the court of chancery. Those corporations which presumed to exercise their elective rights in opposition to his will, were threatened with fines and disfranchisement, and those representatives who dared to sit in the house after such an election were fined and imprisoned. When the house of commons began an examination into the validity of elections, the king prohibited their proceedings, and commanded that a return which had been pronounced by the house illegal should be re-examined by himself and his judges.

The house of commons was thus prevented from being, what it was in the preceding reign, the organ of puritanical complaint; and the convocation was employed in the enactment of canons directly subversive of puritanical principles. The see of Canterbury being vacant, Bancroft, then bishop of London, presided, and delivered a book of canons, already prepared, for the approbation of the two houses. The progress of these canons through the convocation is chiefly remarkable for a debate among the bishops on the use of the cross in baptism. Bancroft and others spoke strongly for the continuance of this ceremony; but Rudd,

\* Stowe's Annals.

---

CHAP.  
XXI.

bishop of Saint David's, delivered his opinion in a speech which even the historians of puritanism have thought worthy of preservation\*. It is replete "with charity and moderation;" and if the enemies of the church could praise it for these qualities, her friends may fairly avail themselves of its manly sense, and its irrefragable arguments in their favour.

"For my part," said this prelate, "I acknowledge the antiquity of the cross, as mentioned in Tertullian, and, after him, in Cyprian, Chrysostom, Augustine, and others. I also confess the original of the ceremony to have been occasioned by the pagans, who reproached the ancient Christians for believing in Christ crucified. By the papists it has been superstitiously abused; but I affirm that it is in the church of England, now admitted by us, and restored to its ancient integrity." Not only did this prelate acknowledge the antiquity and significance of the rite, but expressed an earnest wish that, if it were still prescribed by authority, general obedience might be yielded. Yet, whatever might be his hopes, he could not do otherwise than fear, from the reports brought to him, that many learned preachers, whose consciences were not in the custody of the convocation, nor disposed to show implicit obedience to episcopacy, would not easily comply. On

\* Bishop Rudd's speech has been disgracefully mutilated by Neal, in his *History of the Puritans*; but it has been given at full length by Dr. Z. Gray, in his *Examination of Neal's History*. This able work, now unfortunately scarcely known, received the grateful acknowledgments of bishops Gibson and Sherlock.

this account, if any such non-conformists came under his jurisdiction, he earnestly requested advice as to his conduct. He reminded the house which he addressed, that the impugnors of this ceremony were heard at large in the conference at Hampton-court, and having objected the example of Hezekiah, who broke in pieces the brazen serpent, after it had been abused to idolatrous purposes, they were told that Hezekiah might have innocently preserved the serpent, and abandoned its abuse. Although he was one of those summoned to the conference, yet he was not present at that particular part, as himself and some other divines were requested to retire. But he had no reason to suspect the accuracy of the report which he had read, and as the answer then given was not satisfactory to the non-conformists, he humbly inquired what sound answer might be given to silence their scruples? Whatever he had then said, he protested, was in the way of proposition, and for the peace of the church, and not from a design of arguing against the use of the ceremony. There is a wide distinction between lawfulness and expediency, and between the schismatical and the scrupulous. At the conclusion of his speech he gave a disinterested testimony to the moderation of Whitgift, and vindicated the memory of the departed primate from the charge of intolerance and persecution. Under the government of the late archbishop, ceremonies were not so rigidly urged, but that many learned preachers enjoyed the liberty of omitting them, on condition that they did not openly disturb the peace of the established church, nor openly revile its ordinances.

A. D.  
1604.  
James I.



CHAP.  
XXI.

---

Therefore he wished now to hear a reason why these ceremonies should be more strictly enforced, when the number of papists was increased. He ended by expressing his earnest hope that, if there could not be a toleration for non-conformists of sober and discreet behaviour, there might be, at least, a mitigation of the penalty for non-conformity.

The bishops of London, Winchester, Ely, and Lincoln, answered this speech; but when the bishop of Saint David's would have rejoined, he was prohibited by the president from again addressing the house. He submitted with cheerfulness, affirming that, as nothing was more dear to him than the peace of the church, he was determined to exert his strenuous endeavours to bring others to unity.

After this debate the book of canons found an easy passage through both houses of convocation, and they were ratified by the king's letters-patent under the great seal. They were collected by Bancroft out of the articles, injunctions, and synodical acts passed and published in the reigns of Edward the Sixth and Elizabeth. They have still a certain force, and imperfectly supply the place of a body of canon law; but as they were never confirmed by parliament, it has been adjudged that they are binding on the clergy only, and not even on the clergy, when contrary to the statute or common law. This rule must be understood with some limitations; for the canons of James, in many cases, still regulate the practice of the ecclesiastical courts; and, generally, the judges, and still more frequently the suitors, in these courts, belong to the laity.

These canons are a collection of such ancient ecclesiastical constitutions as appeared agreeable to the civil government of England, and to a protestant episcopal church. It is needless to say, that many of them are at this time difficult, and even impossible, to be observed; and it is notorious that others have been annulled by subsequent acts of parliament. They have incurred an unmerited censure of being levelled solely against the puritans, and of ministering to priestly ambition. But several of these canons are directed against papal usurpation, and the supremacy of the pope is distinctly denied. Neither is their design to encourage, but to moderate, priestly domination. The church of England is defined to be a church established by law, under the king; and the impugnors of the regal supremacy, not the enemies of extravagant church power, are anathematized. They assert the regale, against a popish conclave and a presbyterian synod.

A. D.  
1604.

---

James I.

James estimated his prerogatives too highly, and understood them too well, to ratify any canons which asserted the independence of the church on the monarchy. In his ratification he commanded that they should be diligently observed and executed; and, to secure a more punctual obedience, it was ordered that every parochial minister should annually read them in his church before divine service.

The presidency of this convocation was exercised by Bancroft as bishop of London; but at the end of the year he was appointed to succeed Whitgift in the see of Canterbury. Equal to his predecessor in theological learning, and superior in elocution,

CHAP.  
XXI.

he was inferior in the knowledge of mankind and in the arts of government. With respect to discipline, Whitgift, with all his laudable strictness, was supposed to be an Erastian \*, and his high Calvinistic doctrines were not accompanied, as is too frequently the case, with intolerance towards those who differed from him †. Bancroft, though the friend of regal prerogative, asserted the divine right of episcopacy, and he was opposed to the puritans equally in doctrine as in discipline. It is not surprising, therefore, that they should have loaded him with the heaviest weight of censure, and have reprobated him as the declared enemy of the civil and religious liberties of his country ‡. His unrelenting rigour in enforcing conformity gave a new appearance to religion; and the early days of Elizabeth's reign, and of Parker's ecclesiastical administration, seemed to be revived §. He attempted to enlarge the jurisdiction of the spiritual courts, and framed a list of grievances, in the name of the clergy, against the prohibitions of the temporal courts. This remonstrance being delivered to the judges, they unanimously resolved, sir Edward Coke being at their head, that the articles of Bancroft were contrary to law.

\* The book of Erastus *De Excommunicatione* was purchased from his widow by Whitgift, and printed by the archbishop in London, under fictitious names of the place and printer. Selden de Synedriis. Yet Whitgift refused to license the *Harmony of Confessions*.—Strype's Life of Whitgift.

† Harsnet, Bancroft, and Buckeridge, all Arminians, were chaplains to Whitgift.

‡ Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 1.

§ Collier's Ecclesiastical History, b. 8.

An event at this time happened, which diverted the attention of the king and his government from the turbulent faction of the puritans, to a more dexterous and dangerous class of enemies. All the inventive genius and refined policy of the Jesuits, all the efforts of insinuating craft and audacious rebellion, had been employed to bring back Great Britain and Ireland under the yoke of Rome. A stratagem was at last devised, which has scarcely a parallel in history; and it was nothing less than to destroy, at one blow, the king, the prince of Wales, and both houses of parliament, by the explosion of an immense quantity of gunpowder, concealed for that purpose in the vaults under the house of lords. The conspirators in this plot imagined that, as soon as the horrible deed was accomplished, popery would be restored in the place of the protestant religion.

A. D.  
1605.  
James I.

The discovery of this sanguinary conspiracy has been commonly ascribed to the penetration of the king; but some historians have asserted, with great probability, that the first intimation of it came from Henry the Fourth of France, who had first heard of it from the Jesuits. An anonymous letter, sent to lord Monteagle, has been supposed to be an artifice of Cecil, who was previously acquainted with the motions of the conspirators, and suffered them to proceed to a certain extent\*.

When the plot had been discovered and defeated, the first consequent measure was a public condemnation of the principles whence it originated.

\* Heylin says that the king and his council mined with them and undermined them, and by so doing blew up their whole invention. History of Presbytery.

---

CHAP.  
XXI.

The king opened the parliament in person, and acquainted the lords and commons with the circumstances and atrocity of the design. He acquitted all foreign princes and their ministers of having any participation or knowledge of it, and he does not even charge the detestable principles from which it proceeded on the whole body of the Romanists. Notwithstanding their superstitions, some of them were good subjects; his late injury had not led him to adopt the uncharitable opinion of the puritans, for he thought their cruelty worthy of the fire who will admit no salvation to any papist.

The principal conspirators, who had not been able to escape, or who had not been killed in an attempt to break their prison, were convicted on a legal trial, and executed. Yet these were supposed to be only the instruments of some higher direction, and it was on no light grounds that the king and his ministers were persuaded of the implication of the Jesuit missionaries in the plot. Henry Garnet, the provincial of the English Jesuits, was apprehended, and imprisoned in the Tower, on a charge of concealing the conspiracy; and although he could not deny a previous knowledge, he excused his secrecy by alleging that it was revealed to him under the seal of confession. Overal, then dean of Saint Paul's, divested this excuse of its speciousness, by discriminating between a confession of things done, and a communication of an intention to do something in future. He urged further, that the most able casuists inculcated, that an intention, however confidentially imparted, ought to be discovered, when the concealment is likely to

prove dangerous to the state. The argument of Overall completely disconnects the culpability of Garnet from the question, whether the communication was made at the time of confession, and whether it was made to Garnet alone.

A. D.  
1606.

James I.

Garnet's trial was postponed several months, and his execution was delayed some time after his trial. James might have spared his life, if, on being interrogated concerning the jesuitical doctrine of equivocation, he had not asserted its lawfulness. He avowed that, in all cases in which men were required to accuse themselves, it was justifiable to employ equivocation, and to confirm equivocation, if it were necessary, by an oath. The man who maintained such opinions could not reasonably complain, if the king refused credit to his asseverations of innocence, and permitted the law to take its course\*.

The discovery of this conspiracy occasioned another measure, which brought the loyalty of the Romanists to a decisive test. It gave rise to the OATH OF ALLEGIANCE†, or of submission and obedience to the king, as a temporal sovereign, independent of any earthly power. The oath of allegiance was distinguished from the oath of supremacy; for the latter acknowledged the king to be the supreme head of the church as well as of the state, and pressed on the consciences of the puritans as well as the papists. But the oath of allegiance might be taken by all such Romanists as

\* Lingard's History of England, vol. ix. 8vo. c. 1: "To these avowals I ascribe his execution."

† Ibid. 1 James I. c. 4.

CHAP. renounced the papal power of deposing and mur-  
XXI. dering kings, and disposing of their dominions.

---

The probability that James intended by this oath to relieve one portion of his Romish subjects from the burden of the penal laws has been admitted, even by those who question the intentions of the framers of the statute. By the prescribed oath, not only was the deposing power of the popes disclaimed, but a declaration was added, that to maintain it was impious, heretical, and damnable. It has been insinuated that many would readily make the disclaimer who would refuse to swear to the declaration, and that the supporters of the obnoxious doctrine would gladly justify their refusal of the oath, by objecting to the harsh and improper epithets in which the deposing power was renounced. It is a sufficient answer to this supposition, that none of the Romanists who were willing to make the disclaimer solicited the omission or alteration of the offensive terms in which the doctrine was condemned, but that their objection was against the renunciation of the doctrine itself.

When the oath, in conformity with the directions of the statute, was tendered to the members of the church of Rome, the Jesuits and the seculars were divided in opinion. The Jesuits in general condemned it; but Blackwell, the archpriest of the seculars, decided in its favour; and to determine between the opposite parties the controversy was referred to Rome.

October. Paul the Fifth, the reigning pontiff, issued a brief in favour of the jesuitical decision, and in

condemnation of the oath of allegiance, because it contained many things contrary to faith and salvation \*. The brief was sent to Holtby, who had succeeded to Garnet as provincial of the Jesuits, and was retained by Holtby during several months. At length the provincial delivered it to Blackwell, who, aware of the consequences, received it with sincere grief, and, when he notified it to his flock, was careful to append to it an admonition, that it was to be considered only as the private opinion of Paul the Fifth. The pontiff, finding that the authority of his first brief had been questioned, issued a second, not to Blackwell, but to the whole body of the English Romanists. To remove any misapprehension, the pope assured them that the first brief had been drawn by his special direction, and that therefore they ought to conform themselves to its plain and obvious construction.

A. D.  
1606.

James I.

The second brief was accompanied by a letter from Bellarmine to Blackwell. The archpriest had been committed to prison, and had obtained his enlargement by taking the oath of allegiance. To prevent any censure for his compliance, he had justified his conduct in a letter to the clergy of his communion. He stated that, after a close imprisonment of twelve days, and eight examinations at Lambeth, he had been constrained to admit the insincerity of many belonging to his own communion; that the archbishop had pressed him with the papal briefs, and his own letters, and that he could not avoid the evidence adduced against him. He was informed that the parliament had purposely

July 7.

\* *Cùm multa contineat quæ fidei et salutis aperte adversentur.*  
Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. Appendix, No. 101.



CHAP.  
XXI.

avoided to call in question the authority of the pope to excommunicate, and for that reason he had ventured to say, that it was improbable the pope would ever exercise this authority against the king of England; but that, if ever such excommunication should proceed from the apostolic see, he should, notwithstanding, continue in his loyalty and obedience. His judgment was, that all good catholics would concur with him in opinion, and he exhorted his brethren to persuade the laity to take the oath, and thus exonerate themselves from the grievous imputations of treason and treachery.

Bellarmino was not pleased with this justification, and, in a strain of expostulation, informed Blackwell that, notwithstanding all the modifications and disguises put upon the oath of allegiance, it was levelled against the pope's supremacy. The pope himself was so far from allowing it on any consideration of personal danger, that he removed Blackwell from his office, and directed a third brief to Birchett, the succeeding archpriest, declaring that to take the oath would incur a forfeiture of all the rights and privileges granted by the apostolic see.

As a proof that the papal authority had suffered a great diminution, even with those who assented to the doctrines of the Romish church, the oath was taken by most of the English laity. It was taken spontaneously by the peers in communion with the church of Rome, on different occasions, in the house of lords\*.

\* Lord Teynham alone eluded it, by never attending in his place in parliament more than once during each session. Lingard's History of England, vol. ix. 8vo. c. 1.

But the controversy rested not here. Bellarmine, who was justly considered as the Coryphæus of that band of polemics which the order of Jesuits had trained, wrote against the oath of allegiance under the feigned name of Tortus, and had the honour of encountering a royal antagonist. James sent forth his “Apology to all Christian Princes,” wherein he vindicated himself from the charge of persecuting the papists, and reproached the pope with ingratitude, in return for the free liberty of religion granted to the papists, for the favours which he had conferred on many individuals of that communion, and for his relaxation of the penal laws.

A. D.  
1607.  
James I.

While the oath of allegiance was a cause of division among the papists, the oath of supremacy was an offence to the puritans. They daily increased in numbers, and, in proportion to their numbers, in their animosity to the church. Before the Hampton-court conference, they had objected to the ceremonies of the church, as inconvenient, and unauthorized by Scripture; but afterwards they opposed these ceremonies as sinful. Even the liturgy and the articles did not pass without censure, for they both contained several things which were contrary to the law of God.

There were two demands offered by the puritans at the Hampton-court conference, which the king and the bishops had engaged to satisfy: the necessity of a new catechism and a new translation of the Bible had been strongly urged, and these deficiencies the governors of the church prepared to supply.

The primitive catechisms consisted of nothing

## CHURCH HISTORY

But the common opinion of mine, who was, I think, one of that band of persons who had trained, with regard to the under the feigned name of the honour of ecclesiastical discipline, sent forth his "Apology" wherein he vindicated himself from persecuting the papists, and with ingratitude, in return for the religion granted to the papists which he had conferred on the that communion, and for the penal laws.

While the oath of allegiance was in vision among the papists, the was an offence to the papists. increased in numbers, and numbers, in their anniversary, the Hampton court anniversary, to the ceremonies of the same, and unauthorised by the papists. they opposed these ceremonies, as the portion as- surgy and the article of that division e, for they both came from a collation e contrary to the papists, and the portion There were two divisions, and the portion he Hampton court anniversary, to the whole body.

the most eminent fathers,  
the propriety of the place and

fully and accurately stated by Lewis, in  
translations; and by Fuller, in his Church

CHAP.  
XXI.

more than the repetition of the baptismal vow, the creed, and the Lord's prayer; and, with the addition of the ten commandments, this was the sum of the English catechism at the time of the reformation. Those catechisms which had been published in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth were not only too long to be committed to memory, but contained many refined and controversial points, above the capacity of the illiterate. The catechisms of Poinet and Nowell were too prolix, as that in common use was too brief. Some explanation of the protestant doctrine on the sacraments was thought necessary, even for the most unlearned Christian. The number of the sacraments having been reduced from seven to two, and the doctrine of transubstantiation having been rejected by the English church, it was thought fit to state in a plain manner the nature and end of sacraments in general, and of the two still retained, baptism and the Lord's supper. This necessary undertaking the king intrusted to the bishops, and it was performed, at their recommendation, by Overal, one of the divines at the Hampton-court conference. His performance shows the facility with which his comprehensive intellect could adapt itself to popular instruction, and it fully merits the approbation and esteem with which it has been ever regarded. The catechism, with its supplement, excels all other didactic formularies, it being so concise that it can be retained by the most barren or tender memory, so full that it contains all things necessary to salvation, and so moderate, or rather so catholic, that it may be used by almost every denomination of Christians.

The translation of the Bible, as it was a work of far greater magnitude and difficulty than the catechism, required a larger degree of labour, and a longer space for its performance. The royal commission was issued soon after the conference at Hampton-court, but three years passed away before the work was begun, and another three years had elapsed before it was brought to a termination. Fifty-four of the chief divines in both universities were nominated in the original commission; but seven of these either died before the translation was completed, or, from diffidence, declined to engage in the undertaking. Its execution, therefore, devolved on the remaining forty-seven, and they were divided into six companies. The first company translated from Genesis to the First Book of Chronicles; the second to the prophet Isaiah; the third translated the four greater Prophets, with the Book of Lamentations, and the twelve minor Prophets; the fourth had the Apocrypha; the fifth undertook the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Book of Revelations; while to the sixth were assigned the canonical Epistles. Each individual translated the whole portion assigned to his respective division; that division selected the best interpretation, from a collation of all these separate translations, and the portion being completed, was submitted to the other divisions for the approbation of the whole body.

A. D.  
1606  
to  
1611.  

---

James I.

“ Regulations \* used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and

\* These rules are fully and accurately stated by Lewis, in his *History of Translations*; and by Fuller, in his *Church History*.

---

CHAP.  
XXI.

the analogy of faith," were prescribed for the guidance of the translators. They were directed to consult all the modern translations, but to adhere as closely as possible to the Bishops' Bible. They were not to change words which had been familiarized by long use, and had, consequently, acquired a sacred appropriation. Thus the word bishop was not to be changed into superintendent, priest into elder, deacon into minister, and church into assembly. When a word had different significations, that was to be retained which was most commonly used by the fathers. The division of the chapters was not to be altered, unless necessity should require.

The contributions of the learned were solicited from all parts, and their different opinions were deliberately examined, without any regard to the complaints of the tardiness with which the work proceeded. The translators met at Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster, and the translation at length appeared, with all the improvements which could be derived from united industry and abilities. The final review and superintendence of the publication were committed to the care of Bilson, bishop of Winchester, and Myles Smith, afterward bishop of Gloucester; and the last of these divines wrote the preface, which is still prefixed to the larger editions. The marginal references and the chronological index were subsequently furnished by bishop Lloyd, and annexed to the volume.

To transcribe all the commendations bestowed on this work by the most eminent theologians would be impossible; to select from so large a number that which is most distinguished for dis-

crimination and felicity of expression would be invidious, even if possible; and to attempt an encomium more appropriate than many which have been already written would be unpardonable presumption. The translation has been allowed, by all sects and denominations of Christians, to be equally remarkable for the general fidelity of its construction, and the magnificent simplicity of its language. The captious, and such as seek for blemishes, are disposed to cavil at its minute imperfections, which in a work of such value should not be invidiously detailed. Those few passages, which, by being erroneously translated, have furnished occasion for unjust and licentious aspersions against the sacred volume, have been so clearly and satisfactorily explained, and vindicated by judicious comments, that no man can be misled in his conception of their meaning who is desirous of obtaining instruction. To amend these passages will be the object of all future translators; who will be undoubtedly solicitous of adhering as closely to the present version, and of adopting where they can a construction familiarized by long use, and endeared by habitual reverence, of which the style has long served as a standard of our language, and of which the peculiar harmony and excellence could never be surpassed by any change that refinement might substitute\*.

During the period when the English clergy were employed on a work whose value is acknowledged with pious gratitude by posterity, the spirit of sec-

A. D.  
1606  
to  
1611.  

---

James I.

\* Bishop Gray's Key to the Old Testament, Introduction.  
VOL. II. Q

CHAP.  
XXI.

---

tarian discontent was mischievously active. The house of commons was once more the organ of puritanical complaint, and one of the members gave a particular representation of the national grievances, and of the unsuccessful attempts made for their redress. The speech contained a heavy charge against the bishops in the exercise of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for depriving, disgracing, silencing, and imprisoning such of God's ministers as he had furnished with most heavenly graces to call men to repentance. By the laws of God and of the land, ecclesiastical persons should use only the spiritual sword, by exhortation, admonition, and excommunication, for these are the keys of the church, to exclude impenitent sinners. The temporal sword should be left to the civil magistrate; yet some ecclesiastical persons still presumed to use both swords. A complaint was also made against the canons made by the clergy in convocation, some of which extended to the bodies and property of English subjects.

To check this freedom of speech, the king summoned the two houses of parliament to Whitehall, and informed them that he did not intend to govern by the absolute power of a king, though he knew that the power of kings was like the divine power: for as God could create and destroy, make and unmake, at his pleasure; so kings could give life and death, judge all, and be judged by none. He further said, that as it was blasphemy to dispute what God might do, so it was sedition in subjects to dispute what a king might do in the height of his power. He therefore commanded them not to



meddle with the main points of government, which would be to lessen his kingcraft, who had been thirty years at his trade in Scotland, and had served an apprenticeship of seven years in England.

A. D.  
1610.  
James I.

Those maxims, which James delivered in homely language, were inculcated in a more elaborate form by Cowell, a civilian, and vicar-general to the archbishop of Canterbury. He went so far as to affirm that the king is above the laws; that he is not obliged to call a parliament to make laws; and that the consent of the subject is not necessary to enable him to raise subsidies. The parliament intended to bring its author to punishment; but the king interposed, and frustrated the intention. He published a proclamation, forbidding the reading of Cowell's book, and screened the person of its author by proroguing the parliament.

The commons, not intimidated by this defeat, in their next session persisted in asserting their grievances, and in praying redress. In one of their petitions, they represented the arbitrary conduct of the court of high commission, and with great humility besought the king to ratify a law, which they had prepared for reducing its authority within just and reasonable limits. They affirmed that the statute of Elizabeth, by which the court had been first legalized, had been found inconvenient and dangerous; that the court had not only taken cognizance of temporal rights, but had invaded the ancient ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and that it was impossible to ascertain the limits of their power. The king, instead of acceding to the remonstrance, was so highly offended with its plainness and sincerity, that he dissolved the par-

Dec. 3.

CHAP. liament, before a single act had passed during its  
XXI. session \*.

When James left Scotland to take possession of the English crown, he avowed his preference of the presbyterian Scottish kirk to the episcopal church of England ; but soon after he had settled in his new kingdom, he discovered that he had formerly dissembled his religious opinions, or that he had afterwards changed them. To bring the two kingdoms to an uniformity of ecclesiastical government was his professed design, by proposing England as a model for his ancient kingdom. No longer under the necessity of disguising his sentiments, he expressed his aversion to the Scottish presbytery ; and it was expressed, like all his other antipathies, strongly and offensively. He charged the presbyterians, and not unjustly, with a love of domination, and with a hatred of kingly power ; and, even when emancipated from their thralldom, he remembered with anguish, not unmixed with shame, their insolent treatment of his mother, and their tyrannical usage of himself†. To show the sincerity of his conversion to episcopacy, he nominated bishops to fill the sixteen bishoprics of Scotland ; but as all the episcopal estates had been annexed to the crown, the dignities were only titular, and the prelates had neither income nor jurisdiction. This was far from satisfying him ; and, in a parliament assembled at Perth, he obtained an act to restore the bishops to their tem-

1606.

\* Fuller's Church History, b. 10.

† "I remember how they used the poor lady, my mother, in Scotland, and me in my minority." Speech at the Hampton-court Conference.

poralities, and to repeal the former act of annexation. By this act the bishops were restored, not only to their revenues, but to their seats in parliament.

A. D.  
1610.

---

James I.

The general assembly of the kirk was filled with dismay and indignation, at witnessing this infringement on the presbyterian discipline. A solemn protest was made in the name of Christ, in the name of the kirk in general, in the name of the respective presbyteries, and in their individual names as pastors and office-bearers within the same, against the erection and confirmation of the bishoprics by parliament; and the protest was accompanied by a petition that the dissent of the assembly might be recorded and registered.

In consequence of this protestation, two conventions were holden at Linlithgow, to settle the differences between the parliament and the general assembly, and a committee was selected out of both to adjust the terms of agreement. The committee consisted of two earls and two barons, as commissioners, on behalf of the king; five bishops, two professors of the universities, and three other divines, on the part of the episcopal church; and, to preserve a numerical balance, ten ministers were appointed on the part of the presbyterians. At Falkland, where the committee first met, no business was done; but having adjourned to Striveling, the bishops, with some difficulty, established their right of being perpetual moderators in all kirk assemblies. To increase the power of the prelates, the king erected a court of high commission, and enrolled some of the bishops among its members.

CHAP.  
XXI.

1610.

Still there was wanted, to the completion of the episcopal character, the sanction of the general assembly, and consecration; and, to obtain the first requisite, an assembly of the kirk was convened at Glasgow, the earl of Dunbar and the archbishop of Saint Andrews appearing there as the king's commissioners. Dunbar opened the meeting by reading a letter from the king, stating that he had recovered the ecclesiastical jurisdiction from the hands of the laity, that he had hoped to receive an application from the church to restore the primitive form of episcopal government; but that, not having received it, he had convened a general assembly. A committee was then appointed to draw up a scheme of discipline; and the articles, being submitted to the whole assembly, were almost unanimously approved\*. The bishops were declared to be moderators of every diocesan synod, and they, or their deputies, moderators in every weekly exercise. Ordination and deprivation of ministers, excommunication and absolution, visitation of churches, and institution to benefices, were rights once more attached to the episcopal order. It was farther resolved that every minister, before his admission to an ecclesiastical benefice, should swear obedience to the king and his ordinary; and that no minister should speak or preach against the acts of the assembly. The question of the parity or imparity of ministers was not to be discussed in the pulpit, under the penalty of deprivation.

\* There were only three dissentients out of one hundred and forty. Spotswood, *Refut. Libel. de Regim. Eccles. Scottic.* p. 83.

To obtain a spiritual character superior to the order of presbyters, it was necessary that the new bishops should receive consecration. Soon after the assembly was dissolved, the king sent for the archbishop of Glasgow to attend him in England, and to bring two other bishops, selected by himself. The king, on their arrival, informed them, that he had recovered the temporalities of the bishops, but that he was unable to convey a spiritual authority; they could not assume such an authority without consecration, and there were not left enough of the episcopal order in Scotland to perform the ceremony. He had therefore summoned them to England, that, having themselves been rightly invested with the episcopal character, they might communicate it to their brethren on their return.

A. D.  
1610.  
James I.

To remove any jealousy of reducing the Scottish in subjection to the English church, the archbishops of Canterbury and York were to have no share in the solemnity, but a commission was issued to the bishops of London, Ely, Bath and Wells, and Rochester. A difficulty was started by Andrews, bishop of Ely, that, before the consecration, the Scottish prelates should be ordained priests, because they had never received episcopal ordination. The invalidity of presbyterian ordination the Scottish divines were unwilling to admit, and Bancroft decided that where episcopal ordination could not be had, ordination by presbyters must be deemed lawful. Abbot, bishop of London, was of opinion that there was no necessity of passing through the inferior orders of deacon and priest, but that the

CHAP. episcopal character might be conveyed at once\*.  
XXI. The difficulty was settled according to the sug-

Oct. 21. ggestion of Abbot, and the three Scottish prelates were consecrated in the chapel of London-house.

In this manner James established his supremacy over the kirk of Scotland, and subverted its presbyterian constitution. Contrary to the sense of the majority of the Scottish nation, the bishops were made pastoral superintendents, moderators of synodical assemblies, lords of parliament, lords of the privy-council, and lords-commissioners in ecclesiastical causes.

Of these measures, Bancroft was supposed to have been the principal adviser, and incurred the heaviest load of obloquy. Death, however, soon removed him beyond the reach of human censure; for he survived the consecration of the Scottish prelates only ten days. Whether James fully coincided with the opinions of Bancroft, and whether the opinions of Bancroft were still to be acted on, depended chiefly on the choice of a successor.

The acknowledged merit of Andrews, bishop of Ely, pointed him out as the fit metropolitan of the English church; and the other bishops were so deeply impressed by this conviction, that they formally recommended him to the king. On the character of Andrews, thus distinguished by the general suffrage of his brethren, who can forbear to dwell?

By those who had the best opportunities of ap-

\* This is stated by Collier to have been the opinion of Bancroft; but Neal, with more probability, has ascribed it to Abbot.

preciating its excellence, and who were qualified to bestow on it a discriminative commendation, this eminent man has been called Doctor Andrews in the schools, Bishop Andrews in the church, and Saint Andrews in the closet. In all these capacities, though long since "dead, he yet speaketh." His theological knowledge, and particularly his skill in the sacred languages, qualified him for taking a prominent part in the last translation of the bible; his eloquence in the pulpit may be estimated from his sermons, which, though vitiated by the quaintness and pedantry of his age, contain passages worthy of admiration, and even of imitation; his devotions are still one of the best manuals for private use, and their merit will be impressed on the mind more strongly by recurring to the apostrophe of their latest editor: "Pray with bishop Andrews for one week, and he will be thy companion for the residue of thy years: he will be pleasant in thy life, and at the hour of death he will not forsake thee\*."

A. D.  
1610.  
James I.

Though sanctity and devotion were the most conspicuous features in his character, yet he was remarkable for skill and address in business. His principles of church government were those of Bancroft, but he asserted them without bitterness. The doctrinal Calvinists have never presumed to claim him as their own, and they have been constrained to speak of him with respect. His principles on civil government are a complete refutation of the popular assertion that the Arminians under the house of Stuart were the friends of despotism;

\* Bishop Horne.

CHAP. for Andrews was moderate, and even liberal, in his  
XXI. political opinions\*.

1610.

That such a man should have been designated as the most proper head of the church, is an honour to the judgment of the English prelates. They had reason to believe that the opinion of the king agreed with their own; and, under this persuasion, they retired to their respective diocesses. But by desisting from their solicitations they failed in their object†. The earl of Dunbar, taking advantage of his frequent intercourse with James, and of his recent services in the establishment of a Scottish episcopacy, effectually recommended Abbot, bishop of London, to preside over the church of England. When James complied, he told Abbot that he had conferred on him the primacy, not for his own sake, but for the sake of the earl of Dunbar.

\* For an anecdote in point, see Johnson's *Life of Waller*.

† Collier's *Eccl. Hist.* vol. ii. b. 8.



## CHAPTER XXII.

Opposition of James to the Doctrines of Arminius.—His Controversy with Vorstius.—Quinquarticular Controversy.—Synod of Dort.—Decline of doctrinal Calvinism in the Church of England.—Partiality of James to the Doctrines of Arminius in his latter Days.—Relaxation of the Penal Laws against the Papists.—Writings of Montague.—Death of James I.

AT the commencement of his reign, James was A. D.  
 an enemy to a Scottish presbytery; but it was not James I.  
 till Abbot had succeeded to the primacy, that he declared his hostility to the Arminian doctrines. The one he thoroughly understood from his own experience; but the other he understood through the misrepresentations of others. But the antipathy of James to Arminianism, at any part of his reign, will rescue it from the imputation that it is favourable to despotism. It has no necessary connexion with any form of civil or ecclesiastical government, or with popery and arbitrary power. The conduct of the Calvinistic and Arminian divines in the reign of James has been adduced to establish such a connexion; but no example is less in point. Whitaker at Cambridge, and Robert Abbot at Oxford, both doctrinal Calvinists, decidedly opposed the Calvinistic discipline, and especially on account of its encroachments on the prerogatives of the crown. James himself, whether

CHAP. opposed or favourable to Arminianism, was con-  
XXII. sistent in his assertion of the divine right of kings.

On the death of Arminius, the curators of the university of Leyden had chosen as his successor Conradus Vorstius. This divine had published a treatise on the nature and attributes of God, against which exceptions had been taken by the Calvinistic clergy of his own country; but from which he vindicated himself by a defence or denial. He even retorted on his enemies the heavy charge of wresting insulated passages of his work from the evident scope and tendency of the whole treatise. Though his abilities and virtues were highly esteemed, even by those who differed from him, yet the clergy of Amsterdam remonstrated with the states against his settlement at Leyden. To strengthen their remonstrances, they applied to the English ambassador, and requested him to represent the case to his sovereign; and the curators of the university consented to defer the induction of Vorstius into the professorship, until the exceptionable treatise had been submitted to the criticism of the English monarch.

James read and disapproved, and having in vain endeavoured to hinder the promotion of the author, attempted a confutation of the work. To show his detestation of it, he ordered it to be publicly burnt in London, and in both the universities, and transmitted the following expostulation to the states, on account of their patronage of Vorstius: "As God has honoured us with the title of defender of the faith, so, if you incline to retain Vorstius any longer, we shall be obliged not only to separate and cut ourselves off from such false and heretical

churches, but likewise to call upon all the rest of the reformed churches to enter upon a common consultation, how we may best extinguish and send back to hell those cursed heresies which have newly broken forth. And as for ourselves, we shall be obliged to forbid all our youth from frequenting an university which is so infected as Leyden\*." He transmitted other memorials, in which he styled Arminius a heretic, and an enemy of God, Vorstius a wicked atheist, and Bertius†, another disciple of Arminius, worthy of fire. In conclusion, he published a royal declaration, expressed in very unprincely language, containing an account of all which he had done in the affair of Vorstius, assigning as his motives, the glory of God, his love of his friends and allies, and his fear lest the same heresy should infect his own dominions. This document was printed in French, Latin, Dutch, and English, that all Europe might witness the strength of his zeal, and the weakness of his reason.

As D.  
1611.  
James I.

1612.

After this spontaneous and unmeasured declaration of his hostility to Arminianism, it will appear more strange than discreditable that he should soon have moderated his language. But in the following year, he informed the states, that having read the opinions of both parties, and the arguments by which their respective systems were supported, it did not appear to him that either of them was inconsistent with the Christian faith, or the salvation of souls.

1613.

\* Brandt's Hist. vol. ii.

† Bertius had written a book, entitled *De Apostasiâ Sanctorum*, and sent it to archbishop Abbot.

It is not difficult to assign the cause of this moderated tone in one whose hostility had exceeded the bounds of decency and reason. The demands of the Arminians had been always liberal; they required nothing more than toleration; and they argued, that as the Belgic confession had not determined the points in debate, every man had a right to determine for himself. Some of the most eminent individuals in the republic had exerted their efforts to accommodate these differences; and hence one conference took place at the Hague, another at Delft; and hence also the states had issued an edict of pacification. This edict was the composition of Grotius, then nominated pensionary of Rotterdam, a name which can never be mentioned without reverence by the jurist, the statesman, and the divine.

This edict the states were desirous to submit to the king of England, and to the English bishops; and that it obtained the approbation of James is attested by an authority which it would be presumptuous to question. Casaubon, in a letter to Grotius\*, stated that he had a conference with the king of England, with the archbishop of Canterbury, and with other eminent prelates, concerning the edict of the states; that the king, and all who read it, approved, not only the design, but the form and substance of the edict, because it kept clear of Manicheism on the one hand, and of Pelagianism on the other, and because it confirmed that doctrine which ascribes the beginning, pro-

\* Casaubon, *Epist.* 963, ed. Almöv. Casaubon held a prebend in the church of Canterbury.

gress, and end of human salvation to God alone, without a contempt of good works. This letter of Casaubon, when compared with the intimation of James to the states, authorizes the inference, that the edict of pacification had so far operated on the English king, that he was inclined to grant at least a toleration to the Arminians.

A. D.  
1613.  
James I.

Yet, though this might be the sentiment of James, and of the English clergy in general, the evidence that Abbot approved the edict of pacification is liable to just exception. Those who think most favourably of this prelate must allow that his rigid attachment to doctrinal Calvinism rendered him incapable of estimating justly the qualities of the Arminians, and that, where Arminianism was concerned, he was alike deficient in judgment and candour. It is not probable that an edict composed by Grotius would have received the approbation of Abbot, when Grotius himself was an object of his sincere dislike, and, it is to be hoped, of his affected contempt. When this ornament of his nation and of literature came to England, in order to soften the prejudices of James and of the English clergy against the Arminians, Abbot gave an evident proof of his narrow and intolerant spirit. He represented Grotius as a pedant, and related with high complacency the congenial opinion of some English civilians and divines, that the knowledge of the illustrious foreigner, both in law and theology, was small and superficial\*. Yet to the honour of the English prelacy, more than of Gro-

\* In a letter to sir Ralph Winwood, preserved in Winwood's *Memorials*, vol. iii. p. 459.

tius, it must not be forgotten, that those qualities which could not subdue the moroseness, and which perhaps irritated the jealousy of Abbot, commanded the esteem and admiration of Andrews.

Whatever might be the effect of the edict of pacification in England, supported as it was by the personal representations of Casaubon and Grotius, it had no effect in appeasing the dissensions of the states. The Arminians and Gomarists, or Calvinists, mutually charged their respective systems with heresy. The pulpits, instead of exhortations to practical piety, resounded with unprofitable and angry dissertations on questions the most remote from practice, and as each party alternately prevailed, the other was dispossessed of the churches. The magistrates were divided as well as the clergy, one city or town was ready to take up arms against its neighbour, and at length the Arminians and Gomarists, under the names of Remonstrants and Contra-remonstrants, were transformed into two political factions.

This change in the complexion of the Arminian controversy was owing to causes entirely foreign from religion. A secret misunderstanding had for some time subsisted between the stadtholder, Maurice, prince of Orange, and some of the principal magistrates and clergy of the republic, and this disagreement at last broke out into open enmity. The views of Maurice have been differently represented; but the most probable explanation of them is, that he intended to subvert the independence of the republic, and to secure to himself the dignity of count of Holland. His aim was discovered by the three pensionaries, Olden Barnevelt, Hooger-

bects, and Grotius, and these three individuals had always favoured the Arminians. On this occasion the Arminians naturally ranged themselves on the side of their patrons, which was the side of political freedom, and by their conduct furnished another proof that Arminianism has no necessary connexion with despotic power. Their adversaries, the Gomarists, took the contrary part, and espoused the interests of the aspiring Maurice. Though Maurice in his religious opinions did not agree with the Calvinists, he entered into a close union with them, and resolved to crush the Arminian party, which had opposed his ambitious designs. The leading men who sat at the helm of government were displaced; Grotius and Hoogerbeets were condemned to perpetual imprisonment, while Olden Barnevelt, whose hairs were grown gray in the service of his country, at last lost his life on a public scaffold\*.

A. D.  
1613.

James I.

1619.  
May 13.

The remonstrants could not be fairly or even colourably accused of violating the laws, and therefore could not be subjected to the cognizance of any civil tribunal; but it was easy to wound them through their religion. That their cause might be regularly condemned, it was judged expedient to bring it before an ecclesiastical assembly, or a national synod. This method was agreeable to the general principles of the Calvinists, who hold that spiritual concerns ought to be decided in a religious

\* Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. vol. v. c. 3. When Barnevelt was executed it is said that prince Maurice, to feast himself with the cruel pleasure of seeing his enemy perish, beheld the spectacle through a glass. The people looked on with other eyes, for many came to gather the sand wet with his blood. Burigny's Life of Grotius, p. 65.

CHAP.  
XXII.

assembly. It was not less agreeable to the inclinations than to the principles of the Calvinists, for they knew that in any synod which might be convened, they would possess an overwhelming majority. Notwithstanding, therefore, the dissent of three of the estates, and of the whole body of the remonstrants, this controversy was referred to the decision of a national synod.

Accordingly the synod was convoked at Dort, in the name of the states-general, but by the advice and under the control of Maurice. The classes of the several towns met previously in a provincial synod, and elected deputies to represent them in the national synod. The remonstrants having protested against the lawfulness of the national synod, since the states-general had no authority in matters of religion \*, complained of injustice and partiality in the mode of conducting these provincial elections. In consequence of this dissatisfaction, the remonstrants absented themselves from their respective classes, and yielded their power without a struggle into the hands of their enemies.

The national synod of Dort consisted of thirty-eight Dutch and Walloon divines, five professors of universities, and twenty-one lay elders, amounting altogether to sixty-one individuals, of whom not more than three or four were remonstrants. But to render the synod ecumenical in name, if not in reality, other countries were invited to send deputies. The king of France refused permission

\* Olden Barnevelt maintained that this was an act of sovereignty which belonged to each province separately and respectively. Carleton's Letters.



to the protestant divines of his kingdom to attend the synod; but twenty-eight deputies were collected from England, Geneva, Embden, Hessia, Switzerland, Nassau, and Wetteravia.

A. D.  
1619.  
James I.

James had watched the progress of the controversy with attention, and therefore his motive for sending English divines to the synod cannot be attributed to surprise. It is not improbable that personal friendship for Maurice, or political considerations, might have some weight; but the prevailing motive was his love of theological controversy, and his bias towards the contra-remonstrants, from the influence of Abbot, and Montague, bishop of Winchester. Four English divines were nominated to assist in the deliberations of the synod of Dort: Carleton, bishop of Llandaff, and a brother of the English ambassador at the Hague; Hall, dean of Worcester; Davenant, Margaret professor, and master of Queen's-college, in the university of Cambridge; and Ward, master of Sidney-Sussex college, in the same university. Balcanqual, a native of Scotland, but not a presbyterian, was commissioned to represent the Scottish kirk.

Before these deputies left England they received instructions from James as to their conduct. They were to inure themselves to the Latin tongue, that they might deliver their opinion with facility; they were to consult and agree among themselves on any proposition before it was discussed in the synod; and if, in the course of debate, any new question should arise, they were again to hold a separate consultation how far it was agreeable to the church of England. They were to abide by

CHAP.  
XXII.

their own confessions of faith, and to conform to those of others as far as was consistent with honour to their national church. They were to conduct themselves with moderation, and in any doubtful point were to consult the English ambassador, sir Dudley Carleton, who well understood the differences between the contending parties.

After the divines, both foreign and domestic, had delivered their credentials\*, the synod proceeded to the election of its proper functionaries. Rogermann, a divine noted for his implacable hostility to the remonstrants, was chosen its president. Jacob Rowland, and Herman Taukelius, were assessors; Heinsius was appointed scribe, and Dammon and Homonius the secretaries. On the right and left hand of the president were seated the lay deputies of the states, next to them the Netherland professors of divinity, and then the ministers and elders according to their rank, the ministers of the Walloon churches sitting last. Next to the deputies of the states sat the English divines, as the most honourable place, and the second place of honour was left vacant for those who never intended to be present—the protestant divines of France.

\* It was a strange and anomalous character in which the English divines appeared. They attended as a sort of theological agents on the part of king James. And it is curious that they were smuggled into the assembly by a contrivance between the states and sir Dudley Carleton. When the foreign divines, and the English among them, were called upon for their credentials, the lay commissioners answered for them, that they had already presented them to the states-general. With this answer the synod was content. See Nichols' Translation of the Works of Arminius, vol. i.

Such was the arrangement of the synod; and in giving their votes, the members were not to be reckoned individually, but the deputies from each church were formed into a college, and each college was entitled to a vote. Balcanqual was taken into consultation, and joined in suffrage with the English college, though he did not sit with the other English divines, having a place by himself as representative of the Scottish kirk.

A. D.  
1619.  
James I.

The controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians related to the doctrines of predestination and grace; but it had ramified into five points, and hence it was called the quinquarticular controversy. The five points were original sin, irrespective election and reprobation, particular redemption, irresistible grace, and final perseverance. All these points were held affirmatively by the Calvinists, and on these the synod had to decide.

When all the members of the synod had assembled, they took a solemn oath that, throughout all its transactions, they would not make use of any human writings as a guide, but would refer themselves to the word of God alone, as a sure and infallible rule of faith. They solemnly engaged to have nothing in view but the honour of God, the peace of the church, and the preservation of sound doctrine. Each of the deputies when he took the oath, standing up in his place, and laying his hand on his heart, appealed to his God and Saviour, and besought the assistance of the Holy Spirit.

Though the motive which prompted James to participate in the transactions of this synod may be doubtful, yet the principle by which he selected

CHAP.  
XXII.

the divines whom he deputed is obvious. They were avowedly favourable to the contra-remonstrants, a merit which compensated for the irregularity of their appointment, and which compensated also for the want of all other qualifications. Of one of these delegates, it is impossible not to lament that he could ever have engaged in a transaction for which his catholic charity, and his singleness of heart, rendered him peculiarly unfitted. It is impossible not to lament that Hall, whose writings have placed him in the highest class of English literature, should ever have bewildered himself in the inextricable labyrinth of the quinquarticular controversy. Happily for himself, happily for posterity, sickness prevented him from any active concern in the business of the synod, and the only part which he performed was that of preaching a Latin sermon before the assembly. It will be read with pleasure, at this distance of time, though it was too candid and too moderate for those to whom it was addressed. From the text, "Be not righteous overmuch, neither make thyself overwise," he pointed out the ways in which a maxim, apparently at variance with the tenor of Scripture, might be reconciled with it. He also showed how this excellent maxim was transgressed. It was violated by seculars, when, sitting in the place of justice, they adhered too closely to the letter of the law, instead of regarding equity: it was violated by divines when they presumed to pry into the secret things of God. The preacher next reproved the prevailing disputes concerning predestination; and, in order to end them, his advice was, that the contending parties should exhibit

Nov. 29.

to the **synod** a plain and perspicuous paraphrase of Saint Paul's reasoning **on that point**, in his epistle to the Romans. If the meaning of that discourse were well understood, the controversy would be at an end. He also exhorted the synod to adhere to the former determinations of the reformed churches on these points; and, with a wonderful simplicity, told his auditory that the English monarch, the wisest, next to Solomon, that heavenly taught king, had charged the English divines to keep unaltered the former confessions\*. For this communication of instructions, delivered in confidence, and intended to be kept in secrecy, Hall received a reprimand, in the form of a caution, from the English ambassador at the Hague.

A. D.  
1619.  
James I.

This sermon was all the concern which Hall was able to bear in the synod of Dort; for the climate being unfavourable to his constitution, he soon removed to the Hague, and not long afterwards returned to England. On his departure he received, from the president and his assessors, the grateful valediction of the synod. Hall, in his farewell address, was not deficient in expressions of complimentary regret at the necessity of his leaving an assembly, which resembled heaven more than any earthly place, in which he would gladly pitch

\* “Rex noster, serenissimus noster rex Jacobus, cujus nomine exultare mihi videtur tota ecclesia Dei, regum quos sol unquam vidit, post Salomonem, Θεοδιδακτον, sapientissimus, in suâ illâ aureâ epistolâ monuit, illustrissimi ordines, nobisque in mandatis dedit, illud totis viribus urgere, illud unum inculcare, ut receptæ hactenus fidei, communique et vestræ, et aliarum ecclesiarum confessioni, adhærere usque velitis omnes.”

CHAP. his tent, and which he should ever remember with  
XXII. delight.

The place which Hall had vacated was more suitably filled by Goade, a chaplain of Abbot, of whom nothing more can be said than that he was ready to join in any measure which might be adopted against the remonstrants. The synod now commenced its deliberations, and continued them during the space of five months. Hales, of Eton, to whose name has been prefixed the improper epithet of "ever-memorable," was at this time chaplain to the English embassy: he had a place among the hearers for several weeks, and punctually transmitted minutes of the proceedings to sir Dudley Carleton. When Hales quitted Dort, to return to his duties at the Hague, the correspondence was continued by Balcanqual, the Scottish commissioner.

The leading divines of the Arminians appeared before this prejudiced assembly, and at their head was Simon Episcopius. At this time he was a professor of divinity at the university of Leyden; in his youth he had been a disciple of Arminius, but excelled his master in judgment, erudition, and eloquence. He addressed a discourse to the synod, abounding with sound argument, and delivered with a mixture of gravity and earnestness. Such was the impression made on the unprejudiced part of the auditory by this celebrated speech, that Hales declared himself convinced. "From that hour," he observed, "I bade to John Calvin a good night\*."

\* Bishop Warburton's Remarks on Neal.

When Episcopius had delivered his speech, a difficulty arose on the propriety of granting a conference, which had been demanded by the remonstrants, for the purpose of showing that their tenets were founded on reason and Scripture. The Arminian deputies proposed to begin, not with a defence of their own opinions, but with a refutation of the opinions of their adversaries. This proposal was rejected by a majority of the synod, who regarded the remonstrants as a class of men already lying under the imputation of heterodoxy, from which it was their business to exculpate themselves. It was therefore adjudged reasonable that they should set forth and prove their own tenets, before they were allowed to combat the tenets of others. The conjecture is not improbable that the object of the Arminians, in making this proposal, was to draw a portraiture of Calvinism in its darkest colours, and to excite against it this popular feeling. But another conjecture carries with it an equal degree of probability, that the real motive of the synod, in rejecting the proposal, was a dread of the eloquence of Episcopius, and of its impression on the assembly. The Arminian deputies, having been fruitlessly solicited to submit to the mode of proceeding prescribed by the majority, were excluded the synod for their refusal, and they returned home with indignant complaints of the harsh and arbitrary treatment which they had experienced.

In an ecclesiastical history of England, the proceedings of the English college demand the principal attention; for a difference of opinion on doctrine, as well as discipline, existed between the

A. D.  
1619.

James I.

CHAP.  
XXII.

English and the foreign divines. In the hundred and forty-fifth session of the synod, the Belgic confession of faith was laid down as the standard of orthodoxy, by which all its decisions were to be regulated; and the thirty-first article of that confession was in direct contradiction to the articles of the church of England. It rejected episcopacy, whether considered as a divine or a political institution, and pronounced that there is no other head of the visible church than Christ. Carleton, being himself of the episcopal order, entered a protest against this article, in which he was supported by the whole English college. The protest of Carleton, though admitted, and probably entered on the records, was not so far considered as to receive an answer.

When the judgment of the English college on that point of the quinquarticular controversy which relates to the universality of Christ's redemption was read in the synod, it was observed that the Calvinistic distinction between its sufficiency and its efficacy was omitted. The English divines declined to touch on the Calvinistic limitation of those passages of Scripture which speak of Christ dying for the sins of the whole world, to the world of the elect. The fact was, that Davenant and Ward held on this point a middle course between the Calvinists and Arminians. They held the certainty of the salvation of the elect; but they also held that an offer of pardon was made, not only to such as believed and repented, but to all who heard the gospel: they held that a sufficient measure of grace to convince the impenitent, so as to lay their condemnation on themselves, accom-



panied the offer of salvation; and they held that the redemption by Christ was universal, and, consequently, that salvation was attainable by all. Yet a difference of opinion on this vital point did not prevent them from assenting to the determination of the synod \*, that the efficacy of Christ's death was limited to those only who had been from all eternity elected to salvation.

A. D.  
1619.  
James I.

The result of this synod was such as might be expected from the character and opinions of its members. The tenets of the Arminians were condemned, and those of the Calvinists were approved as agreeable to the word of God. It is inconsistent with the design of this work to transcribe or abridge the canons of the synod: a more compendious and an equally perspicuous method will be a statement of the Arminian tenets on the five points which, by the decrees of the synod, were condemned.

1. God from all eternity has determined to bestow salvation on those whom he foresaw would persevere to the end in their Christian faith, and to inflict everlasting punishment on those whom he foresaw would continue in their unbelief, and to resist his divine succours. 2. Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, has made an atonement for the sins of all mankind, and of every individual; but none except those who believe in him can be partakers of this divine benefit. 3. True faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force and operation of free-will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable of doing or thinking

\* Balcanqual says that king James and the archbishop of Canterbury desired them to comply.

**CHÁP.  
XXII.**

any good thing; and therefore regeneration, or renewal by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, is necessary to man's conversion and salvation. 4. This divine grace or energy of the Holy Ghost, which heals the disorders of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection every thing which can be called good in man; consequently, all good works are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace: nevertheless, this grace does not constrain any man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted, and rendered ineffectual, by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner. 5. They who are united to Christ by faith are thereby furnished with abundant succours to enable them to triumph over the seduction of Satan and the allurements of sin and temptation; but such may fall from their faith, and finally forfeit this state of grace\*.

It is remarkable that the supralapsarian and sublapsarian divines forgot their debates and animosities, and united their force against the Arminians. Their tenets were condemned by the synod; and, in consequence of this decision, the remonstrants were treated as the enemies of their country and of their religion. They were deprived of all their situations and employments, both ecclesiastical and civil; and, which was thought a more severe punishment, their ministers were silenced, and their congregations were suppressed. To this last ordinance the people refused obedience; they refused

\* This article was at first stated differently: it was not decided whether the elect could fall from grace. Mosheim, Eccl. Hist. vol. v. cent. 17.

to discontinue their attendance on the ministry of their pastors, and, by their refusal, incurred the aggravated resentment of their superiors. They were punished by fines, imprisonment, and exile. To avoid persecution, many retired to Antwerp, and many to France; while a considerable number accepted the proffered protection of Frederic, duke of Holstein. They gained a settlement in his dominions, built the town of Fredericshall, where they lived in security and the open enjoyment of their religion. Among the persecuted ecclesiastics who followed this colony was Vorstius, whose approximation to the Socinian tenets contributed to bring a stigma on the whole body of Arminians.

A. D.  
1619.  
James I.

When the synod of Dort was dissolved, and its canons were promulgated, public opinion was divided, not only on the orthodoxy of the canons, but on the authority of the synod. Its authority was far from being universally acknowledged, even in Belgium, and five provinces \* could not be persuaded to adopt its decisions. The other states were completely satisfied with having accomplished the destruction of their adversaries: they bestowed extravagant praises and munificent rewards on the chief divines, and ordered the original records of the proceedings of the synod to be preserved among their archives.

April 29.

In England the acts of the synod were variously received. The English Calvinists, whether within the church or separated from it, whether supralapsarians or sublapsarians, both then and afterwards expressed the strongest marks of approba-

\* Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Guelderland, and Groningen. Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. vol. v. cent. 17. pt. ii. c. 2.

CHAP.  
XXII.

tion at the conduct of the assembly, and one of them has not scrupled to assert, that the Christian world never beheld such an assembly since the days of the apostles \*. So unconscious was Hall of the real character of this synod, or so blinded by the encomiums which had been so extravagantly lavished on him, that to the end of his days he gloried in wearing the gold medal with which he had been presented on his departure.

But James, with a decided majority of the English clergy, after the first complimentary duties had been rendered to the English college on its return, hesitated not to express a dissatisfaction at the synod of Dort and its decrees. The opinions of Arminius on the five points were adjudged more agreeable to Scripture than those of Gomarus and Calvin. One fact is incontestable, that the decline of doctrinal Calvinism within the English church may be dated from this period†.

The intolerant and persecuting spirit of Calvinism, rather than the Calvinistic tenets, was the principal cause of this declension. It was evident to all impartial observers, that the ruin of the Arminians in Holland had been not only premeditated, but predetermined, before the synod met, and that the synod was chosen as the fit instrument to effect this purpose. The synod was not convened to discuss, on equal terms, the points of controversy between the Arminians and Calvinists;

\* Baxter. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 2.

† The following lines were made in England in contempt of the synod:

“Dordrecht synodus, nodus; chorus integer, æger;  
Conventus, ventus; sessio, stramen. Amen.”

but to promulgate, under a semblance of religion, certain decrees, the publication of which was intended to authorize the infliction of pains and penalties on a large portion of the Belgic community. And when it was further considered that the canons published by the synod related, not to the simple and elementary truths of Christianity, but to questions above the reach of human comprehension, it was not surprising that such an excess of presumption, and such an absence of charity, should have excited a dislike of the Calvinistic tenets. It was no excuse for the Calvinists to allege that Arminianism has a necessary connexion with Pelagianism and Socinianism, or that the Arminians at this time designed to introduce such errors, or that the most celebrated Arminians afterwards actually embraced these heresies. They were not Pelagian or Socinian errors which the synod condemned; but tenets which, whether true or false, have a remote influence on practice, and which may be rejected or believed without any just impeachment of orthodoxy. The Arminians contended that the points in question were not fundamental, and were willing to allow, if they could have been mutually allowed, a toleration. The Calvinists, far from tolerating their opponents, esteemed them as almost without the pale of Christianity; and Gomarus was reported to have said, that he would justly dread to appear in the presence of God with the sentiments of Arminius\*.

The intolerance of the Calvinists not only in-

A. D.

1619.

James I.

\* Burigny's *Life of Grotius*, b. ii. p. 40.

CHAP.  
XXII.

jured their cause in the estimation of impartial judges, but even of many foreign deputies, who were opposed to the Arminian tenets. The equity and moderation of the British divines would have prevented any unfair proceedings; but their opinion and that of the other foreigners was not always heard. When it was proposed that the whole synod should pass its judgment on the conduct of the remonstrants, and that judgment was anticipated to be unfavourable, the provincial deputies were not required to speak, and thus the whole odium of the rude and abrupt dismissal of the Arminian divines was thrown on the foreigners. Whereas, when, on a former occasion, the same question had been proposed, and the foreign deputies had spoken favourably for the remonstrants, the provincials interposed. So that little attention was shown to the judgment of the foreigners, unless it coincided with that of the provincials\*.

The remarkable change in the sentiments of James, after the synod of Dort, was represented by the Calvinists as a conversion to the Romish faith; a representation which acquired credit from his political conduct. His son-in-law, the elector-palatine, by grasping at the crown of Bohemia, had lost his own dominions, and the refusal of James to favour the pretensions of Frederick to the Bohemian sovereignty, and to squander the treasure of England in a fruitless attempt to recover the palatinate, was interpreted into an abandonment of the protestant interest. Clamour was

\* Hales's Works, vol. iii. p. 125.

increased, when an alliance between prince Charles and the infanta of Spain occasioned a relaxation of the penal laws against the papists.

A. D.  
1620.

James I.

To silence these rumours the king called a parliament, and opened the session with a speech in explanation of his religious policy. Religion, he observed, might be supported by two methods, by persuasion and compulsion; but the latter method ought never to be used unless when the first proves unsuccessful. With respect to his own religious opinions, he appealed to his own writings. These were an ample testimony of his integrity, and they were an antidote against error. It was impossible to view the distracted condition of Christendom without grief; but the origin of these distractions could not be justly imputed to him. He had refused to support the pretensions of his son-in-law to the crown of Bohemia for three reasons: first, he would not make religion a cause for deposing kings; that was a maxim of the Jesuits; secondly, he was not a proper judge of the question, had he been impartial; and, thirdly, his connexion with the elector totally disqualified him from interference.

1621.  
Jan. 20.

James could vindicate himself far more successfully for his refusal to aid his son-in-law than for his prosecution of the Spanish alliance. Ostensibly for the purpose of procuring better treatment for the protestants in Roman catholic countries, but really for the purpose of gratifying the Spanish court, the rigour of the laws against the Romanists was relaxed, and some recusants were discharged from prison on giving security for their good behaviour. The lord-keeper, by the king's

CHAP.  
XXII.

command, wrote to the judges, authorizing them to release in their respective circuits all prisoners committed for recusancy, for refusing to take the oath of supremacy, or for dispersing popish books. But this unseasonable lenity being received with discontent, another letter from the lord-keeper justified the king's conduct. The language in which this letter begins is worthy of transcription: "As the sun in the firmament appears to be no better than a platter, and the stars are but as so many nails in the pummel of a saddle, because of the disproportion between our eye and the object, so there is a deep unmeasurable distance between the deep resolution of a prince, and the shallow apprehensions of common and ordinary people."

Common and ordinary people were not to be deluded by these representations, when they saw the papists and Jesuits appearing openly, and disseminating their tenets without danger. Abbot, though retired from public councils, ventured to remonstrate, beseeching the king to consider whether, by the toleration which he had granted, and was about to enlarge, he was not countenancing heresy and superstition. It must be a matter of grief, that a king, who had written so well and so learnedly against such wicked heresies, should at last show himself a patron of those doctrines which he had told the world were idolatrous and detestable. Besides, the toleration which was thus established by proclamation could not be legally established but by a parliament, unless the king was willing to let his subjects see that he might break through the laws at his pleasure\*.

\* Heylin. Cyprian. Anglic. p. 108.



The romantic expedition of Charles and Buckingham to the Spanish court increased the alarms of the protestants, and the papists scrupled not to declare that the object of the prince's journey was a reconciliation with the church of Rome. James was so confident of the religious principles of his son \*, that he was under no apprehensions from the infidelity of Buckingham or the sophistry of the Jesuits, and fearlessly exposed the young prince to the dangers of both. His confidence was not misplaced, and Charles returned with an increased aversion to the Romish faith †.

A. D.  
1623.  
James I.

These Jesuits and Romish priests, under the late relaxation of the penal laws, distributed their tracts without any molestation from the government, and even challenged the English clergy to public disputations. They pursued their attacks on the protestant faith with greater success, on account of the divisions in the church of England. The quinquarticular controversy being agitated with great fierceness, the king transmitted to the archbishop of Canterbury directions for the clergy, commanding them to abstain from preaching, in any popular auditory, "the deep points of pre-

\* James told Maw and Wren, the prince's chaplains, that Charles should manage a point in controversy with the best studied divine of them all; and that he had trained up George (the duke of Buckingham) so far as to hold the *conclusion*, though he had not yet made him able to prove the *premises*. Collier's Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. b. 8.

† "The king (Charles I.) once at Whitehall, in the presence of George, duke of Buckingham, of his own accord said to me, that he never loved popery in all his life; but that he never detested it before his going into Spain." Usher. Parr's Life of Archbishop Usher.

CHAP.  
XXII.

destination, election, reprobation, or of the universality, efficacy, resistibility, or irresistibility of God's grace. Such doctrines were fitter for the schools than for simple auditories. In a letter addressed to the vice-chancellor of Oxford at this time, the king recommended students in theology to apply themselves to the study of the holy Scriptures, of the councils, the fathers, and the ancient schoolmen; but to decline reading the works of the moderns, whether puritans or papists.

Excellent and well-timed as these injunctions were, they called forth the anger of the Calvinists and puritans. The Arminians were now calumniated as papists in disguise, and the Calvinistic tenets were boldly asserted to be exclusively the tenets of the church of England. Popery and Arminianism were convertible terms.

How injurious this imputation was, and how uncharitable the spirit which dictated it, the discomfited Jesuits might have proclaimed. While the Calvinists invoked the assistance of penal laws to silence the arguments of their adversaries, the Arminians came forward with alacrity and confidence, to combat them on equal terms. When the priests and Jesuits challenged the clergy to disputation or conference, it was seen that those who gave up the Calvinistic points were the most powerful defenders of the protestant cause.

It was at this crisis that Laud acquired a reputation which laid the foundation of his future pre-ferment. Transplanted, by the recommendation of the lord-keeper Williams, from the university of Oxford to a Welsh bishopric, Laud had been as yet known chiefly on account of his Arminianism,

and his consequent altercation with that able Calvinistic divine, Robert Abbot. But being removed to a higher station in the church, he soon proved that his Arminianism had no connexion with popery.

A. D.  
1624.  
James I.

Buckingham's mother being a papist, a conference was held in her presence between Fisher, a celebrated Jesuit, on the one part, and White, Williams, and Laud, on the other. Each of these divines disputed with the Jesuit on a separate day, before a large assembly; and although neither the conversion of the noble auditress nor of the wily disputant ensued, yet the triumph of the protestants was so decisive as to subdue the clamours at the lenity of the government towards the Romanists. A petition from the house of commons for the due execution of the penal laws, preceded by a complaint of former remissness, was abridged by the lords; for the late conduct of the king in approving and rewarding the labours of the protestant advocates had rendered any remonstrance unnecessary and disrespectful.

The exertions of another Arminian divine, though equally seasonable and equally sincere, were not met by a similar reward. Montague was not only one of the most learned men of his age, but his learning was set forth to the greatest advantage by an energy of diction rarely to be found. Already had he been advantageously known by a controversy with one whom Grotius called the glory of the English nation, the illustrious Selden. This celebrated character, whose acquisitions were alike multifarious and profound, had published a history of tithes, proving them to be of human appoint-

April 10.

CHAP.  
XXII.

ment and not of divine right. In his preface he had used unwarrantable language in speaking of the English clergy, accusing the whole body of idleness and ignorance, alleging that they had nothing to support their credit but beard, title, and habit, and that their learning reached no farther than the breviary, the postilles\*, and the polyanthea. This insult on his order had been resented with great spirit by Montague, and in an answer he had shown himself equal to his antagonist in historical knowledge, and superior in energy and elegance of diction. The main position of his history, Selden had the honesty or the meanness publicly to retract†; his unretracted censure of the clergy was refuted by the *Diatribæ* of Montague.

When, in consequence of the relaxation of the penal laws by the connivance of the government, the Jesuits dispersed their missionaries in every part of the kingdom, Montague came forward with firmness to resist their advances. After the example of Jewel, but in a more compendious form, he offered a challenge and a defiance to his subtle adversaries. It was expressed in the following terms: "If any papist, or all the papists living, can prove, first, that the present Roman church is either the catholic church, or a member of the catholic church; secondly, that the present church of England is not a true member of the catholic church; and, thirdly, that all or any of those points which the church of Rome maintains against the church of England, are the perpetual doctrine of

\* Postils, marginal glosses, comments; so called from *post illa*, because they were read after the gospel.

† Before the court of high commission, Jan. 28, 1618.

the catholic church, or the concluded doctrine of the representative church in any general or national council approved by a general, or the dogmatical resolution of any one father for five centuries after Christ—I will subscribe\*.”

A. D.  
1624.  
James I.

Instead of accepting the challenge, and proposing a disputation, the Jesuits answered Montague in a short tract†, professing to confute the protestants from their own English Bibles. It contained a list of errors, which they imputed to the reformers generally, but which were really held peculiarly by the Calvinists. The Jesuits, no longer trained in the Augustinian school, opposed the Calvinists with success, pursuing the Calvinistic tenets to their inevitable though not acknowledged consequences, and charging these consequences on the whole body of protestants.

In exposing the sophistry of this tract, Montague was careful to separate the private tenets of the Calvinists from the authorized doctrines of the church of England. On the subject of free will, which the Jesuits accused the protestants of having abandoned, he explained the tenth article of the church with singular perspicuity and force. He observed, that man is there considered in a twofold state, of nature depraved, and nature restored. In his depraved state, free will is denied to man for works of righteousness, not of nature or morality: in his restored state, free will is granted to man for both‡.

\* Gagg for the New Gospel, Address to the Reader.

† New Gagg for the New Gospel.

‡ Gagger, p. 110. Montague appeals to Augustin: “ Qui creavit te sine te, non salvabit te sine te.”

CHAP.  
XXII.

This unanswerable vindication of Montague called forth the indignation of all the doctrinal Calvinists. A host of puny polemics aimed their weapons at the author; and Hall, whose intellect was not sufficiently comprehensive to grapple with the difficulties of the quinquarticular controversy\*, formed a project of pacification†. He had sufficient candour to acknowledge the transcendent abilities of Montague, and more than sufficient piety to see the unprofitableness of the dispute. Well might he exclaim, "We are like quarrelous brethren, who, having agreed on the main division of their inheritance, fall out about some heaps of rubbish."

The more intemperate Calvinists were not to be softened by Hall; and they were conscious that Montague's book, if unanswered, would expose their singularities, and prevent them from passing their private opinions as the doctrine of the church. To make their attack more regular and formidable, two preachers at Ipswich, having perused the treatise, made a collection of some pretended popish and Arminian tenets, with an intention of laying them before the next parliament. Montague, having procured a copy of the information, appealed to the king's protection; and James, thinking the distinction between the doctrines of Calvin and those of the church of England sufficiently defensible, permitted Montague to publish a vindication of himself. James died before the vindication could

1625.  
March 27.

\* Fuller estimates Hall rightly: "*Not ill* at controversies." Worthies of England.

† The way of peace in the five busy articles, commonly known by the name of Arminius.

appear, and the controversy ceased, only to be renewed with greater bitterness in the succeeding reign.

A. D.  
1625.

---

James I.

To add any thing on the character of James is inconsistent with the design of the present work; but the effects of his religious policy ought to be succinctly stated; and a single sentence from a foreign ecclesiastical historian will answer this purpose\*. “He was the bitterest enemy of the doctrine and discipline of the puritans, to which in his youth he had been most warmly attached; the most inflexible and ardent friend of the Arminians, towards whose ruin and condemnation in Holland he had been singularly instrumental; and the most zealous defender of episcopal government, against which he had once expressed himself in the strongest terms.” Such vacillation of character was followed by its natural consequences; and James left the constitution of England, both ecclesiastical and civil, in an unsettled state, languishing under disorders of various kinds. Among the other difficulties with which his successor had to contend, must be enumerated those which were occasioned by paternal misgovernment.

\* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. v.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

Accession and Marriage of Charles I.—First Parliament.—Petition against Popery.—Quinquarticular Controversy brought before the House of Commons.—Montague's Appello Cæsarem.—The King expresses his Displeasure at the House of Commons, and dissolves the Parliament.—Second Parliament.—House of Commons appoints a Committee of Religion, who renew Proceedings against Montague.—Sibthorpe and Mainwaring's Sermons.—Suspension of Abbot.—Third Parliament.—Speeches in the House of Commons against Popery and Arminianism.—Parliament dissolved.—King's Visit to Scotland and Coronation.—His Attempt to bring the Scottish Kirk to an Uniformity with the English Church.—His Return to England.—Death of Abbot.—Succession of Laud.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

CHARLES the First succeeded to his father's dominions at the age of twenty-five years. He was born in Scotland, and baptized by a presbyterian minister of that country; but as soon as his father came to England, he placed his infant son under the superintendence of those divines who were attached to the church of England.

Charles, being a younger brother, was not educated in the expectation of inheriting a crown; and when, by the death of his brother Henry, he became the heir apparent, his original education was not completed. Removed from the authority of his preceptors, he was consigned to the duke of Buckingham. In that nobleman he found a seductive and dangerous companion, although the companion was selected by his father. When he succeeded to the throne, and had abandoned the course



of dissipation which he had eagerly pursued under the direction of his favourite, he followed the paternal example, by admitting the pander to his pleasures as the guide of his councils. No small part of the misfortunes of Charles may be traced to his early connexion with the duke of Buckingham.

A. D.  
1625.  
Charles I.

Immediately on his accession, and before the solemnity of his father's funeral, he married Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry the Fourth, and sister of Louis the Thirteenth, the reigning king of France. The treaty of marriage had been agreed on during the life of the late king, and the articles signed. By this contract the princess was allowed the free exercise of her religious opinions, and, which was more dangerous, the education of all her children, till they had attained the age of thirteen years.

The marriage was first solemnized at Paris by the king's proxy, according to the ritual of the church of Rome, and, secondly, at Canterbury, according to the liturgy of the church of England. The queen brought to England a bishop of the Romish church, and a long train of priests and of monastics, for whose use a chapel was prepared in the king's palace at Saint James's. Next to the early influence of the duke of Buckingham, the marriage of Charles with this princess was the cause of his final ruin, and it was at the time supposed to be a greater judgment on the nation than the plague, which was then raging throughout the land \*. The personal attractions of the queen were great, and her love of intrigue was ardent.

\* Bishop Kennet, Hist. Eng.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

Considering the malignity of the Romish religion, the despotic nature of the French monarchy, the power of a beautiful princess over an uxorious husband, and, above all, considering the trust which was confided to her of educating her children, it was not difficult to foresee the dangers impending over the liberties of England. The queen was devoted to her religion even to bigotry, her conscience was in the custody of her confessor, assisted by the papal nuncio, and a secret cabal of priests and Jesuits.

Her first demand, that the solemnity of her coronation should be performed by the bishops of the church of Rome, was properly refused, and her rigid adherence to it would not suffer her to join in the ceremonial of the English church. She appeared, therefore, only as a distant observer of that interesting and significant rite, and displayed marks of levity on the occasion, which were not calculated to raise her in the estimation of the people.

At the accession of Charles, the government of the kingdom, in all its branches, was managed by the privy council, the star-chamber, and the court of high commission. The privy-council constituted the efficient legislature, its proclamations and orders being the rule of law and the measure of obedience. Though there was not a single parliamentary statute enacted in twelve years, yet in that time there were not less than two hundred and fifty proclamations, every one of which had a legal force, and bound the subject under the severest penalties. The star-chamber was, in effect, the same court with the privy council, being com-

posed of the same persons, sitting in different rooms, and in different capacities \*. They were both become courts of law to determine rights, and courts of revenue to bring money into the exchequer. The privy council, by its proclamations, enjoined that which was not enjoined by law, and the star-chamber punished disobedience to the proclamations of the council. The court of high commission had also overflowed the banks which should have restrained it, not only by interfering in matters beyond its cognizance, but in passing sentences and judgments contrary to law. From an ecclesiastical court, instituted for the reformation of manners, it was grown into a court of revenue for the imposition of arbitrary and excessive fines. The commissioners, not satisfied with the business which was brought before them, sent their commissaries throughout the whole kingdom, to superintend the proceedings of the consistorial courts in the several diocesses. If a bishop were supposed to be negligent in his ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he was frequently cited before the court of high commission, to answer for his remissness. The court frequently detained men in prison during many months, without bringing the prisoners to trial, or even acquainting them with the reasons of their confinement.

A. D.  
1625.  
Charles I.

The first parliament of Charles assembled with no favourable disposition either towards the court or the hierarchy. The king, having, in his speech, solicited the assistance of the two houses for the recovery of the palatinate, assured them that

June 18.

\* Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. v. p. 71.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

though his religion had been suspected, yet no one was more desirous of maintaining the protestant religion than himself. The parliament returned thanks to the king for his gracious communication; but the house of commons, before it entered on any other business, presented a list of grievances. Among others, it set forth the causes of the increase of popery, with the proper remedies. The causes were, the want of a due execution of the penal laws; the interposition of foreign powers in favour of papists; their influx into the metropolis, and their frequent conferences and conventicles there; their open resort to the chapels of foreign ambassadors; the education of their children in foreign seminaries; the want of protestant education in several parts of the kingdom; the unrestrained licence of popish books; and the employment of men disaffected to the protestant religion in the highest places of government\*.

The king, in his answer to each grievance, gave a promise of redress, which it was too well known that his other engagements would not suffer him to fulfil. By his marriage articles he had engaged to set all Roman catholics at liberty; and, in consequence, had ordered the lord-keeper to direct the judges, and other magistrates, to forbear all proceedings against his subjects of that persuasion; it being his royal pleasure that there should be a cessation of all those penalties to which they were liable, by any statutes or ordinances of the realm. When, therefore, the king, in compliance with the parliamentary petition, directed the archbishop of

\* Rushworth's Collections.

Canterbury to proceed against popish recusants, and when a proclamation was published, recalling the English youths from popish seminaries, such palliatives failed to conciliate, because it was well ascertained that these orders would not be executed.

A. D.  
1625.  
Charles I.

The increase of popery was doubtless a proper subject of parliamentary inquiry; but the quinquarticular controversy, to which the house of commons next directed its attention, was not within its competence. Laud had been directed by the king to consult the learned bishop Andrews on the expediency of bringing the subject before the convocation; but that prelate wisely advised that such a theme of interminable contention should be dropped in silence\*.

But the house of commons, unrestrained by any considerations of its incapacity of discussing a question purely theological, rashly entered into a business which properly belonged to the convocation. Arminianism was to be extirpated, as well as popery, and to be overcome by penal laws. It has been already mentioned, that an answer by Montague to a jesuitical tract had given offence to the puritans and doctrinal Calvinists within the church. Two obscure ministers of Ipswich† had collected some passages from Montague's book, which, in their judgment, were heretical, and had preferred a complaint before parliament. The parliament of James coincided in opinion with the complainants; but, after having examined Montague at their bar, had referred the matter to the

\* Collier's Eccles. History, vol. ii. b. 9. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 3.

† Yates and Ward.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

---

archbishop of Canterbury. Abbot, with his Calvinistic bias and his Arminian antipathies, willingly promoted the wishes of the house of commons, and prohibited Montague from writing in future on such topics.

But Montague, encouraged by James himself, had prepared an appeal from the complaints of his two informers, from the censures of the house of commons, and from the partial conduct of the archbishop. The book was licensed by White, dean of Carlisle, a celebrated champion against the church of Rome, on the express command of the king; and was recommended by the licenser as containing nothing which was contrary "to the public faith, doctrine, and discipline of the church of England." Before the book was published James died, and the appeal was sent forth, dedicated to the new king.

In strength of argument, and in terseness of style, this performance of Montague exceeded any of his former writings. It was written under a keen sense of injustice from men calling themselves protestants, and professing an uncommon hatred against popery. That the character now given of the work is not exaggerated, let the following extracts show:

"Upon the indictment, I plead not guilty of both informations, of Arminianism and of popery, and call therein for trial for it from God and my country: the Scripture as the rule of faith, the church applying and interpreting that rule from time to time against all novellers. Dare any of my brethren join issue with me in this?"

Having closed with his antagonists on their ac-

cusation of Arminianism, he thus proceeds: "I disavow the name and title of Arminian; I am no more an Arminian, than they Gomarians, not so much in all probability. They delight, it seems, to be called by other men's names; for anon they stick not to call themselves Calvinists, which title, though more honourable than Gomarians, I am not so fond or doting upon, that I am content to leave it unto those that affect it, and hold it reputation to be so styled. I am not, nor would be accounted willingly, Arminian, Calvinist, or Lutheran, but a Christian. Again for Arminianism, I must and do protest before God and his angels, that the time is yet to come, that ever I read a word in Arminius. The course of my studies was never addressed to modern epitomizers. I betook myself to Scripture, the rule of faith, interpreted by antiquity, its best expositor\*."

A. D.  
1625.  
Charles I.

The conclusion, or corollary of his appeal, will prove what Fuller calls "the equability of his sharpness." Popery is for tyranny; puritanism for anarchy; popery is original of superstition; puritanism the high way unto profaneness, both alike enemies unto piety†."

To answer this powerful appeal was not easy; but it was easy for a puritanical house of commons to silence his arguments by the strong arm of

\* Appello Cæsarem, pp. 9, 10, 11. "He was much skilled in the fathers, and in ecclesiastical antiquity, and in the Greek and Latin tongues. Our great antiquary Selden confesseth as much, though pens were brandished between them, and virtues allowed by one's adversaries may pass for undeniable truths." Fuller's Church History, b. xi.

† Appello Cæsarem, p. 321.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

power. A committee was appointed to examine the appeal, and on the report of that committee, the house voted it to be contrary to the articles of the church of England, and bound the author under heavy recognizances to answer their charges against him.

August 2. Laud, at this time bishop of Saint David's, justly apprehended this interference of the house of commons to be a violation of the royal prerogative, and of the privileges of convocation. Associating with himself the bishops of Oxford and Rochester, the three prelates addressed a memorial to the duke of Buckingham, soliciting his mediation with the king in favour of Montague. The memorial, indisputably the composition of Laud, is temperate, yet decisive. It assumes, that the church of England, at the time of the reformation, declined to declare itself openly on many points of scholastic divinity, and that the points, on account of which Montague was accused, were of that kind. Some of the tenets which he maintained were the resolved doctrines of the church, which all her members were bound to maintain; and others were only fit to be debated in the schools, every man being at liberty to "abound in his own sense." To compel subscription to these subtle and abstruse tenets, was an error which had been avoided by the first reformers, and was one great fault of the council of Trent. Besides, all disputes concerning doctrinal points ought to be determined in a national synod or convocation, assembled under the authority of the king. The church never submitted to any other decision, neither could she, without departing from the ordinance of Christ. When



the "contrary opinions" to those of Montague had been concluded at Lambeth, and were ready to be published, queen Elizabeth, finding "how little they agreed with the practice of piety and obedience to all government," caused them to be suppressed; and though they had since received some countenance from the synod of Dort, yet the decisions of a foreign synod were not, and, it was trusted, never would be, of any authority in England. Of the character of the person thus unjustly accused, who had the honour to be the king's chaplain, the three prelates cheerfully attested, that "he was a very good scholar, and a right honest man," able to serve effectually God, the king, and the church.

A. D.  
1625.  
Charles I.

Montague himself, with the warmth of language natural to his character, and which his personal injuries inspire, had entreated the duke of Buckingham to report his case to the king. "The house of commons," he said, "had no right to prosecute his person, or to censure his book. It was approved by the late king, and sanctioned by the present." He declared, that if he failed to give a solid and full answer to every article objected against him from his book, he would be given up with willingness to the pleasure of his enemies.

These applications to the king produced the desired effect, and he announced his intention of bringing Montague's case before the council; it being a branch of his prerogative to determine offences against religion. He farther expressed his displeasure at the house of commons for calling his own chaplain to their bar, and for raising a false alarm concerning the danger of popery. He

CHAP. dismissed the parliament before the necessary sup-  
 XXIII. plies had been granted for carrying on the war  
 August 12. with Spain, and resolved to supply his necessities  
 by a loan. For this purpose, the gentry of Eng-  
 land were assessed at a certain sum, and had pro-  
 missory letters, under the privy-seal, of repayment  
 within eighteen months. With this loan the king  
 fitted out a fleet, which returned without having  
 performed any achievement.

1626.  
 Feb. 6.

The treasury was soon exhausted, and the war  
 with Spain was not at an end; the king was there-  
 fore obliged to call a second parliament for the  
 supply of his necessities. To avoid the return of  
 such members in the house of commons as had in-  
 sisted on a redress of grievances, they were nomi-  
 nated by the court as sheriffs of their respective  
 counties, and were thus disqualified to sit. But  
 notwithstanding this precaution, a sufficient num-  
 ber of members was returned to express loudly the  
 popular discontent. A committee of religion was  
 appointed, for which there was no precedent, and  
 Pym was constituted its chairman. The writings  
 of Montague were again brought before its cogni-  
 zance, and again incurred its censure. Several  
 passages from his Appeal were collected, and arti-  
 cles of impeachment were exhibited, of setting  
 forth doctrines contrary to the book of homilies  
 and the thirty-nine articles, and of promoting a re-  
 conciliation between the churches of England and  
 Rome.

It does not appear that this impeachment was  
 ever laid before the house of lords, or that the com-  
 mons intended to proceed with its prosecution, for  
 the king once more intimated that these proceed-

ings against one of his own chaplains were highly offensive. He thought that one of his own servants was entitled to the same protection as an ordinary burgess, and again declared his intention of taking the cause into his own hands. This reprimand was soon followed by a dissolution of the parliament.

A. D.  
1626.

Charles I.

To rescue the quinquarticular controversy from the hands of the house of commons, could not be thought unwise or unconstitutional ; for the subject was not within its sphere. It was carried on with great warmth by the clergy on each side, and Montague was attacked by Carleton, one of the divines at Dort, then bishop of Chichester; by Sutcliffe, dean of Exeter; by Featly, a chaplain of Abbot; and by others of inferior note. To accommodate the differences, two conferences were held, and the first took place at York-house, before the duke of Buckingham, the earl of Warwick, and some other temporal lords. The most able divines of each party were selected to manage the debate : on the side of the Arminians were Buckeridge and White; on the side of the Calvinists were Morton, and another divine of great notoriety, Preston. He was the most popular, if not the most profound Calvinist of his time, an excellent preacher, a subtle disputant, and a great politician, one of whom it was acknowledged by his foes, that if he had not too little of the dove, he had enough of the serpent\*. The result of this conference has been

Feb. 11.

\* Fuller's Church History, b. xi. He was chaplain to the duke of Buckingham, who thought, by his means, to gain over the puritans ; but Preston, who was as great a politician as the duke, was not to be overreached. Granger's Biographical History, vol. ii.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

variously related: what was said of it by the earl of Warwick, that none departed from it Arminians who were not so before, gives a triumph to neither party. The first conference proving unsatisfactory, a second soon took place, when Montague was substituted in the room of Buckeridge, on the part of the Arminians. Both these conferences tended to no other purpose, than to increase difference of opinion into personal animosity.

Feb. 17.

The king, therefore, having first suppressed Montague's book, issued a proclamation, prohibiting the discussion of these controverted points, either in preaching or print. He would admit of no innovation in the doctrine, discipline, or government of the church, and he denounced a severe punishment against all who should offend against his injunction, that by the exemplary punishment of a few, others might be warned against incurring the just indignation of their sovereign.

While the house of commons exceeded its province, in attempting to determine theological controversies, the clergy abandoned their proper sphere of duty in deciding political questions. Several gentlemen of property and character having refused to advance by loan the sums at which they had been assessed by the council, were taken from their houses, and imprisoned at a distance from their habitations. The king, however, raised a large sum from the papists, by issuing a commission to the archbishop of York to compound with them for all the forfeitures incurred by their recusancy, since the tenth year of James the First, or for all that should be due in future. By this fatal policy, men well affected to the hierarchy, though enemies to

arbitrary power, were obliged to join the puritans, and to save the nation, by opposing the designs of the court.

A. D.  
1628.

Charles I.

To convince the people that it was their duty to submit to the loan, some of the clergy were prevailed on to preach the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, and the absolute submission of the subject to the will of the prince. Sibthorpe and Mainwaring, two divines of moderate abilities, taught these doctrines from the pulpit, and Mainwaring, in two sermons delivered before the king himself. His sermons, entitled "Religion and Allegiance," taught that the king was above all human law, and that of his own will and pleasure he might impose taxes without the consent of parliament. Those who refused obedience to the commands of the king transgressed the laws of God, and were guilty of impiety, disloyalty, and rebellion. Such were the doctrines delivered from the pulpit, "which were very unfit for the place, and very scandalous for the persons, who presumed often to determine things out of the verge of their own profession, and gave unto Cæsar that which did not belong to him\*."

Sibthorpe dedicated his sermon to the king; but the archbishop of Canterbury having refused to license it, it was licensed by the bishop of London†, by whom it was recommended as a discourse agreeable to the doctrine of the primitive church, and to the established doctrine of the church of England.

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i.

† Montaign.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

The refusal of Abbot to license this sermon was followed by his suspension, and, according to the most probable supposition, was its cause. By one historian\* it has been asserted, that the favourable disposition of Abbot towards the puritans induced the king to place the archiepiscopal jurisdiction into different hands; and by another†, that the archbishop was now suspended for a casual homicide committed seven years before‡. But these improbable suppositions are shown to be completely groundless, by the acknowledgment of lord Conway to Abbot himself. The loss of court favour to Abbot from his adherence to the laws of his country is often adduced to prove that the puritans were martyrs to the cause of civil liberty.

1627.

In addition to the war with Spain, Charles was now about to engage in a war with France; but although it was undertaken for the avowed purpose of maintaining the protestant religion, yet the French and Spanish war were alike hated by the people. Hostilities having commenced, the queen's domestics were sent home, and a fleet was fitted out under the conduct of the duke of Buckingham, which made an unsuccessful descent on the isle of Rhé, with the loss of five thousand men. This disastrous expedition excited the murmurs of the people, and exhausted the public treasury. The king was therefore compelled to adopt the ungrateful measure of calling a third parliament.

1628.  
March 17.

As soon as this resolution had been taken in council, an order was issued for the release of all

\* Heylin.

† Fuller.

‡ He killed the keeper in Bramshill park with a cross bow.

the gentlemen\* imprisoned for their refusal to grant the late loan, most of whom were returned members of parliament. It soon appeared that the king was not disposed to conciliate, nor the house of commons to concede. The king in plain terms informed the parliament, that if it did not provide for the necessities of the state, he should use those means which God had committed to his hands, to save that which the follies of other men would hazard.

A. D.  
1628.

Charles I.

The house of commons was not intimidated by this menace, and commenced the business of the nation with a statement of grievances. Though five subsidies were voted, the bill was not passed until the royal assent had been given to the petition of right. A charge was then preferred against Mainwaring, for having maintained in his sermons the right of the king to raise money without consent of parliament; and an impeachment before the house of lords was conducted by Pym with great vigour and success. The lords in this case acted with an impartiality and firmness worthy of their order. Having found Mainwaring guilty of the charges, they passed the following sentence: that he be imprisoned during pleasure, and be fined in the sum of one thousand pounds; that he make his submission at the bar of the house, and be suspended from his functions for three years; that he be disabled for ever from preaching at court; and that he be also disabled from holding any ecclesiastical dignity or secular office; and that his sermons be publicly burnt in London, and

June 13.

\* To the number of seventy-eight.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

in both the universities. In pursuance of this sentence, Mainwaring appeared at the bar of the house, and made an ample submission, craving pardon of God, the king, the parliament, the church, and the commonwealth.

It would have been undoubtedly an act of prudence as well as of equity in Charles, to distinguish between Mainwaring and Montague; the one had been justly punished by the house of lords, and the other had been most unjustly persecuted by the house of commons. But by bestowing preferment on both, the characters of both were subjected to a stigma, for both received marks of royal favour after they had incurred parliamentary censure. Soon after the recess of parliament, Montague was preferred to the bishopric of Chichester, and Mainwaring was immediately promoted to the deanery of Worcester, and eventually to the see of Saint David's.

Though the king had given his assent to the petition of right in the most ample manner, yet this did not satisfy the commons. While the money bill was passing through the house of lords, the commons were employed in framing a REMONSTRANCE, concerning the grievances of the nation; but the king did not wait to receive it, for as soon as the money bill had passed, he came in person and prorogued the parliament.

June 26.

The commons having been disappointed in presenting their remonstrance to the king, dispersed it through the nation. It complained of many civil grievances, and of many which concerned religion: it complained of the great increase of popery in consequence of a relaxation of the penal



laws; of the preferment of papists to places of trust and honour; and of a commission being issued to compound for the penalties incurred by popish recusants; it also complained of the discouragement shown to orthodox preachers, however conformable or peaceable; of the prohibition of their books, while those of their adversaries were licensed. From general complaints it descended to personal accusations: it complained that the bishops Laud and Neile were suspected of Arminianism and popery, but that the tenets which they held were a sure road to preferment. Arminianism was represented to be a cunning and covert road to popery. It lastly complained of the miserable condition of Ireland, where the popish religion was openly professed, where popish discipline was exercised without control, where monasteries, nunneries, and other religious houses, were rebuilt, and filled with professors of the different monastic orders.

A. D.  
1628.  
Charles I.

The king not only attempted to suppress this remonstrance, but condescended to publish an answer to its allegations. The distinguishing feature of the remonstrance is intolerance; there was to be no toleration for popery, and none for Arminianism. The Calvinistic interpretation of the formularies of the church was, in the judgment of the commons, orthodoxy, and from this standard they would endure no variation.

With respect to the miserable condition of Ireland, of which the remonstrance complained, it is necessary to observe, that the Irish nation had never been converted from the Romish faith. Not long after the English commons had set forth their remonstrance, the following statement of the re-

CHAP.  
XXIII.

ligious condition of Ireland was given by an unquestionable authority\*. “The popish clergy are more numerous than those of the church of England; they have their officials and vicars general for ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and are so hardy as to excommunicate those who appear at the courts of the protestant bishops. Almost every parish has a priest of the Romish communion; masses are sometimes said in churches, and excepting a few British planters, not amounting to a tenth of the people, the rest are all declared recusants. In each diocese there are about seven or eight of the reformed clergy, well qualified; but these not understanding the language of the natives cannot perform divine service, nor converse with their parishioners to advantage, and consequently are in no capacity to put a stop to superstition.” The same authority asserts, that his majesty was, with the greatest part of the country, king only at the pope’s discretion.

When such was the state of Ireland, it was absurd and unjust to fasten the increase of popery in that kingdom on Charles or his counsellors. Yet they cannot be acquitted of blame in selling to the Romanists that toleration, which every peaceable and loyal subject has a free right to enjoy. The remonstrance of the protestant bishops in Ireland, with Usher at their head, was partly reasonable and partly groundless. It was unreasonable to say, that a toleration to papists was a grievous sin, because it made those who granted it accessory to

\* Letter from bishop Bedel to Laud, dated April 1, 1630, preserved in Burnet’s *Life of Bishop Bedel*.

all its abominations, and to the perdition of all those souls that perish thereby\*. But it was no more than just to say, that to grant toleration in consideration of money given, was to set religion to sale, and with it the souls that Christ has redeemed with his blood.

A. D.  
1628.  
Charles I.

Notwithstanding that the English house of commons had joined popery and Arminianism in the same condemnation, and had inflicted a personal censure on Laud, yet the king, soon after the prorogation of parliament, promoted this prelate to the see of London. Scarcely was he settled in his new dignity than he adopted a decisive measure to stifle the predestinarian controversy. He caused the thirty-nine articles to be reprinted with a royal declaration prefixed. It carried an aspect of perfect neutrality; and notwithstanding all the intemperate censure with which it has been assailed, was probably intended to compose the differences between the Calvinists and Arminians. If it had been received with the same spirit by which it was dictated, it would have been a wise and provident measure to secure the tranquillity of the church. On the one hand it prohibited a new interpretation of any of the articles; and on the other hand, it enjoined that all curious search about contested points should be laid aside.

August.

In conformity with this declaration, all books relating to the quinquarticular controversy were called in and suppressed; and to show that the measure was intended to operate impartially, the

\* "From so silly a sophism so gravely delivered, I conclude Usher was not that great man he has been represented." Bishop Warburton.

CHAP. XXIII. works of Montague and Mainwaring were among the first which were prohibited. As this was the case, the Calvinists could not reasonably complain that silence on the five points was imposed on their favourite writers.

1629.  
Jan. 20.

When the parliament commenced its session, after a prorogation of six months, the discussion of religious grievances was renewed. Oliver Cromwell, being of the committee, reported to the house, that great encouragement was given by Neile, bishop of Winchester, to divines who preached popish and Arminian doctrines; he mentioned the favours which had been lately bestowed on Montague and Mainwaring, and added this reflection: "If such be the way to preferment in the church, what are we to expect?" The late declaration prefixed to the articles was made a subject of debate, and it was voted, that "the main end of that declaration was to oppress the puritans, and to give liberty to the opposite party." Rouse and Pym, who had published pamphlets in the controversy, which, if they were deserving an answer, received it, vented their opinions in a place where they were secure from contradiction: "I desire," said Rouse, "it may be considered how the see of Rome doth eat into our religion, and fret into the banks and walls of it, the laws and statutes of this realm. I desire we may consider the increase of Arminianism an error that makes the grace of God lackey to the will of man. I desire we may look into the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny; for an Arminian is the spawn of a papist, and if the warmth of favour come upon him, you

shall see him turn into one of those frogs that rose out of the bottomless pit." Pym, in language less vehement, said: "By the articles agreed on in the reign of Edward the Sixth; by the catechism set forth in his days; by the writings of Bucer and Martyr; by the constant professions, sealed with the blood of many martyrs, as Cranmer, Ridley, and others; by the articles of queen Elizabeth; by the articles agreed on at Lambeth as the doctrine of the church of England, it appears evidently what is the established religion of the realm. Let us, therefore, show wherein the late opinions differ from the truth." "It belongs to parliaments," he continued, "to establish true religion, and to punish false. We must know what parliaments have formerly done in religion. Our parliaments have confirmed general councils. In the time of Henry the Eighth, the earl of Essex was condemned by parliament for countenancing books of heresy. The convocation is but a provincial synod of Canterbury, and cannot bind the whole kingdom. As for York, it is far distant, and cannot bind us or the laws; and as for the court of high commission, that is derived from the parliament\*."

A. D.  
1629.  
Charles I.

After some other speeches of the same complexion, the house entered into the following resolution or vow †: "We the commons in parliament assembled do claim, protest, and avow for truth, the sense of the articles of religion which were established by parliament in the thirteenth year of

\* Rushworth's Collect. vol. i. pp. 659, 660.

† Rushworth calls it a vow.

CHAP. our late queen Elizabeth, which by the public act  
XXIII. of the church of England, and by the general and current expositions of the writers of our church, have been delivered to us. And we reject the sense of the Jesuits and Arminians, and all others that differ from us.”

It was the opinion of Pym, that the work of the Lord ought not to be done negligently, and that the business of religion ought to have the preference of tonnage and poundage. But when that business, in its subordinate importance, at last came before the house, the king sent a message to the speaker, commanding him not to put any question derogatory to the royal prerogative. On receiving this communication, the house immediately and indignantly adjourned, and after adjournment were farther prorogued by the king's order. When the

March 2. time of prorogation had expired, and the house had again met, the business was resumed, and the speaker announced that he had the king's command for a farther adjournment. The greatest confusion ensued, and the speaker was forcibly detained in the chair, till a strong protestation was entered against the arbitrary and illegal conduct of the king. The first article of the protest related to religion, and it was thus expressed: “Whosoever shall by favour or countenance SEEM TO EXTEND OR INTRODUCE POPERY OR ARMINIANISM, shall be reported a capital enemy to the kingdom\*.”

March 10. A few days after this compulsory adjournment, the king came in person to the house of lords, and without sending for the commons according to

\* Rushworth's Collect. vol. i. p. 670.

custom, dissolved the parliament. He made an angry speech against the leading members of the lower house, whom he styled vipers that had cast a mist of undutifulness over their eyes ; “ and as those vipers,” said the king, “ must look for their reward of punishment, so you, my lords, may justly expect from me that favour which a good king oweth to his good and faithful nobility.”

A. D.  
1629.  
Charles I.

To justify these proceedings to the nation, Charles was advised to publish “ a declaration of the causes of dissolving the last parliament.” He vindicated his attempt to silence the predestinarian controversy, and imputed the blame of relaxing the penal laws against the papists to his subordinate officers and ministers. “ We profess,” is the language of the declaration, “ that as it is our duty, so it shall be our care, to direct well ; but it is the part of others to perform the ministerial office.” The declaration concluded with a profession, that the king was resolved to maintain the true religion of the church of England, without conniving at popery or schism.

The declaration being unsatisfactory, was followed by a proclamation, not better calculated to appease public discontent, for it put an end to all expectations of another parliament. The king declared that he intended not to overcharge his subjects with any new burdens, but was satisfied with the duties received by his royal father. Yet a report had been industriously divulged that another parliament was shortly to be called, a report which he thereby contradicted ; accounting it his undoubted prerogative to call, continue, and dissolve parliaments at his pleasure.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

The constitution of England was now an absolute monarchy, and the legislative functions of government were assumed by the king and the privy council. To acquit Laud of advising these unconstitutional measures is impossible, and it is certain that he incurred the largest share of public obloquy among all the king's ministers. After the death of Buckingham, he interfered in the administration of public affairs, more, according to his own acknowledgment, than was agreeable to his natural disposition, and indisputably more than was consistent with his sacred function, or with the national welfare. Though the suspension of Abbot was taken off, yet the church was entirely under the government of Laud, and he had also the chief direction in matters of state.

1630.

In the church, his great object was the suppression of puritanism, and of the predestinarian controversy; and for disobedience to the king's declaration Davenant, then bishop of Salisbury, fell under his animadversion. At the synod of Dort, this prelate had professed his belief in the doctrine of universal redemption, but on the other points he was Calvinistic. He strenuously maintained the doctrine of predestination, and had the temerity to preach on this point before the king. A transgression of the royal command so notorious, could not pass without notice or impunity. It was not unfairly construed into a contempt, and Davenant was summoned before the privy council. He presented himself on his knees, but the temporal lords commanded him to rise and make his defence. The accusation was managed by Harsnet, Laud standing by in silence. Harsnet reminded



Davenant of his obligations to king James, of the piety and prudence of the present king, and of the wisdom of the declaration which had been so rashly and needlessly disobeyed. Davenant replied, that he was sorry to see an established doctrine of the church received with distaste; that predestination was taught in the thirty-nine articles; and that these articles were not within the scope of the king's declaration. Having desired that the declaration might be produced, Harsnet answered, that "the godly doctrine of predestination" was not intended to be contradicted; but the king having enjoined silence on such a mysterious point, it was highly offensive that the injunction should be transgressed in the king's presence. Davenant having promised not to offend in future was dismissed without farther punishment; but at his next appearance at court, the king did not fail to remind him that the doctrine of predestination was too mysterious for popular comprehension, and too abstruse for the pulpit.

A. D.  
1630.  
Charles I.

Oxford having elected Laud its chancellor, a change was gradually introduced into the theological opinions and studies of that university; but the disciplinarian and doctrinal Calvinists had strengthened their interest in the bosom of the church. When Preston was at the head of the puritans, a project was formed of setting up lectures in market towns. For this purpose, a self-constituted corporation had purchased such impropriations, as were in the hands of the laity, for providing a maintenance for "a constant preaching ministry." The persons appointed by the corporation as lecturers were generally non-con-

April 12.

1632.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

1633.  
February.

formists, many of whom had been suspended by their ordinaries. Laud saw that this corporation was "the main instrument of the puritan faction" to ruin the church, and the feoffees were prosecuted by the attorney general. The feoffments were cancelled in the court of exchequer, and the impropriations confiscated to the crown\*.

Disappointed at the conduct of his English parliament, Charles had for some time directed his thoughts towards his native country. He had not visited Scotland since he was taken from it in his infancy, and he thought it a just mark of respect and affection to the Scottish nation, that the solemnity of a coronation should be performed in the capital of his northern kingdom. Religion was not foreign to the purpose of his visit, for he had long cherished a wish of bringing the Scottish kirk to an exact conformity with the church of England. Although James had succeeded in establishing a Scottish episcopacy, yet the ecclesiastical government was presbyterian, and there was no form of religion, no liturgy, no beauty of holiness†. To supply these defects, Charles was attended by Laud, and the ceremony of the Scottish coronation was managed under the direction of this confidential prelate.

June 18.

Ten days after the coronation, the Scottish parliament met, and voted a large sum for the necessities of their prince. After receiving this welcome supply, Charles proposed to the parliament two bills relating to religion; one concerning his own

\* History of the Troubles of Archbishop Laud, p. 373.

† Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i.

prerogative, and the apparel of kirkmen ; the other a bill for the ratification of former acts concerning religion. In the Scottish parliament it was customary for the king, lords, and commons to sit in the same house, and when the question was put on the first bill, the parliament wished to divide its substance. The lords agreed to that part which related to the kingly prerogative ; but dissented from that part which related to the apparel of kirkmen. But the king refused to divide the bill, and commanded that a direct affirmative or negative should be given to the whole bill. The king himself marked the several votes, and on casting up the numbers, the clerk of the parliament declared that the bill was carried in the affirmative. Some of the members denying this, the king said, that the declaration of the clerk must stand, unless any would go to the bar and accuse him of falsifying the record of parliament. The latter bill, ratifying and approving all former acts concerning religion, was then passed without opposition.

A. D.  
1633.

Charles I.

This treatment of the Scottish parliament disgusted all ranks and orders of the nation. A pamphlet was immediately dispersed, stating that for a king thus to overawe and threaten his parliament was a high breach of privilege, and that parliaments were a mere pageantry, if the clerk might declare the votes as he pleased, without a scrutiny. The king in eight days from this event dissolved his Scottish parliament, with strong manifestations of displeasure towards the dissentient lords, and speedily returned to England.

July 20.

The return of the king was shortly followed by the death of the archbishop of Canterbury ; and

August 4.

**CHAP.  
XXIII.**

the recent services of Laud, in Scotland, confirmed the resolution which Charles had long formed of raising his favourite prelate to the highest dignity in the church. Laud had not travelled as fast as the court, and had not reached London until the death of the primate; on his first presentation of himself before his sovereign, he was saluted by his new and higher title, "My lord of Canterbury, you are welcome\*."

Though Laud had long exercised the archiepiscopal authority, yet his actual appointment to the primacy aggravated the public discontent. His character was now fully developed, and it was known to be in most respects opposite to that of his predecessor. Long had he suffered under the unmerited imputation of being a papist, and possibly the puritans experienced a more severe and rigorous usage for propagating the calumny. He entered on his high office with this unkindly feeling towards a formidable body of religionists, and with a professed intention that the discipline of the church should be felt†. He was not more rigid in exacting conformity than Whitgift or Bancroft; but the age of Charles was widely different from that of Elizabeth.

To estimate rightly the character of Laud, he ought to be viewed as the patron of learning, and the persecutor of nonconformity; and if, as archbishop of Canterbury, his intolerance was predominant, as chancellor of Oxford his munificent and generous promotion of learning exceeded his intolerance. It was in this station that his eminent

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i.

† Ibid.

virtues shone in all their lustre; and his aptitude for academical discipline was strikingly contrasted with his unfitness for pastoral care. To "win souls" was no part of his knowledge; and he was inclined to show the least indulgence, where forbearance was most needed, to the infirmity and indocility of ignorance. Of these he was impatient, and towards these he manifested, what was far more galling than intolerance, contempt. To Hales and to Selden he could be a warm friend, or a generous adversary; and towards great abilities, even when opposed to him, his hostility was unmingled with envy or vindictiveness\*. Though commonly accused of jealousy and intolerance with regard to the doctrinal Calvinists, yet the charge is without foundation; he was too practised a polemic not to know that on the abstruse points, which were so fiercely debated, there will ever be a difference of opinion; and the charge of intolerance from a doctrinal Calvinist against Laud, must provoke a recriminatory glance towards Usher. The bigotry of Laud was shown in an uncompromising and rigid adherence to the ceremonial parts of religion, and this quality, joined with a total want of courtesy, and an absence of all pretensions to sanctity, rendered his piety suspected. Great as his virtues really were, they accelerated the downfall of that church which he loved, and which, under happier circumstances, he would have adorned.

A. D.  
1633.  
Charles I.

\* His treatment of Williams is an exception to this observation.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

Ecclesiastical Administration of Laud.—Book of Sports.—Prosecution and Punishment of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick.—Opposition of Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, to the Injunctions of Laud. His Suspension and Imprisonment.—Attempts of Laud to aggrandise the Church.—Liturgy attempted to be introduced into Scotland.—Consequent Tumults.—Solemn League and Covenant.—Charles raises an Army to subdue the Covenanters.—Pacification of Berwick.—Scottish Parliament sanctions the Abolition of Episcopacy.—Charles resolves on a second Expedition against the Scots.—A Parliament called and dissolved after sitting three Weeks.—Convocation prolongs its Sittings.—Canons of 1640.—Subsidy granted by the Clergy for the Scottish War.—Disastrous issue of the second Expedition.—Charles is obliged to call the Long Parliament.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

---

OF that period which comprises the ecclesiastical administration of Laud, the chief part of the narrative must relate to its difficulties, its troubles, and its errors: yet to relieve the painful recital, let it be preceded by the reflection that, during this period, the church of England enjoyed a temporary tranquillity, and a partial repose. Let it not be forgotten, that the system of discipline established by Laud received the approbation and support of some of her brightest ornaments, who lived and died in the firm belief that her communion was the purest, because it approached nearest to primitive Christianity. Let it be told that Laud, in that part of discipline which related to government, maintained the principles of Ban-

croft, and in that which related to ceremonies, he formed himself on the model of Andrews. A. D.

The commendations of his contemporaries on his "great wisdom \*," and his zeal in the promotion of Christianity, are abundant and heartfelt, and these contemporaries were as far removed from the church of Rome, as from the discipline of Geneva; yet they were as scrupulously attached to the peculiar discipline of the English church as Laud himself. The apophthegms of sir Henry Wootton †, and the dissertations of Joseph Mede, are direct evidences that it is possible to find and preserve a middle course between these extremes. In the life of Ferrar may be found ascetic regularity without monastic rule or vow; in the life of Herbert may be found pastoral vigilance without spiritual domination. All these ornaments of their Christian profession were trained in the Laudian school; all were ready to acknowledge his beneficial labours in supporting the discipline of the church of England.

Charles I.

The first principle which Laud maintained in spite of calumny and misrepresentation was, that the church of Rome is a true church. Yet in this he only agreed with many divines not so hostile to puritanism as himself. Hall, not less than Laud, could see the advantage which a denial of this prin-

\* Sir H. Wootton's last will.

† To the trite question, "Where was your religion before Luther?" Sir Henry's answer was, "My religion was to be found then, where yours is not to be found now, in the written word of God." *Life* by Isaac Walton. There is another maxim which ought to be quoted: "Take heed of thinking the farther you go from the church of Rome, the nearer you are to God." *Ibid.*

CHAP.  
XXIV.

ciple must give to the Romanists, and he could distinguish between the corruptions and the visibility of the church of Rome. Laud might go farther, and might devoutly wish a union between the two churches; but it was not for the victorious antagonist of Fisher to wish this union, by conceding a single protestant doctrine.

Another principle maintained by Laud was, that the church of England had a distinct character from all foreign protestant churches; that being neither Lutheran nor Calvinistic, she was hated by the Calvinists, and not loved by the Lutherans. He denied that theirs was the religion of the English church; and while they had his charity and his prayers, he refused to them the right hand of fellowship.

By those who acquit Laud of any sinister views of assimilating the English church to that of Rome; and by those who agree with him in maintaining a distinct character in the church of England from other protestant churches; it must be lamented that his assertion of these two principles was frequently offensive in the manner, and imprudent in the degree. His antipathy to puritanism often led him into errors, which his enemies sincerely believed to originate in an affection for popery. An illustrative fact occurred soon after his elevation to the primacy.

The morality of the Lord's day, or as it was improperly termed the Sabbath, had been a subject of controversy in the preceding reign, and, after a temporary cessation, was now renewed with increased violence. In the reign of James the puritans exalted the sanctity of the Sabbath to the rank



of any moral duty\*; and in proportion as the Sabbath was raised, the other festivals and fasts, appointed by the church, were depressed. The puritans gradually introduced a neglect of Lent, of the Ember days, and all acts of humiliation were reduced to occasional fasts. The Jesuits and Papists persuaded the people that the reformed religion was incompatible with Christian liberty, and that it was no better than Judaism.

A. D.

Charles I.

To preserve the people from popery and fanaticism, James published a "book of sports," accompanied by a declaration that, after service, the people should be permitted to enjoy those lawful recreations which were therein specified. This declaration was ordered to be read in the parish churches; but Abbot actually prohibited it from being read at Croydon, and it was at length suffered to sleep in silence.

1618.

May 24.

By the advice of Laud, Charles was induced to republish his father's declaration, at a time the most unseasonable, when the Romish religion received an improper countenance from the government. The puritans were roused to indignation by this declaration, and the sober part of the nation was filled with sorrow. It was rendered more obnoxious by a peremptory injunction, that it should be read in all parish churches. Some ministers, after reading it, immediately read to

1635.

\* Some were so fanatical as to utter the following paradoxes: "It is as great a sin to do any servile work on the Lord's day, as to kill a man." "To make a feast, or a wedding dinner on a Sunday, is as sinful as for a father to kill his child." "To ring more than one bell on a Sunday, is as great a sin as to commit murder." Heylin's History of Presbytery. b. 10.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

their congregations the fourth commandment, adding, "this is the law of God, that is the law of man." Some incumbents consigned the unwelcome office to their curates, while others refused compliance on any terms. The moderation of Laud in his own diocese was remarkable, since he suspended only three clergymen for refusing to read the declaration, and these offenders had been guilty of other irregularities; but his lenity was imputed by his adversaries, not to charity, but to policy. The court, at the head of which was a strong Romish party, encouraged these recreations by its example; and in its observance of the Lord's day, England assimilated herself to the practice of Roman catholic countries. Laud himself, as much from a wish to counteract the sullenness and austerity of the puritans, as from any love of the amusement, frequently made the game of bowls his Sunday recreation in the garden at Lambeth.

The levity and voluptuousness of the court, and the encouragement given by some of the prelates to its licentiousness, induced Prynne to write his *Histriomastix*. Its author was a student of the law, and a member of Lincoln's-inn, a man of morose countenance, of mortified habits, and of severe application to study. His reading was extensive, and his writings were proportionably voluminous\*; but his style was heavy, and the arrangement of his matter confused. His works, therefore, were read by few, though they wanted

\* His works amounted to forty volumes, in folio and quarto. The *Histriomastix* is a thick quarto, containing one thousand and six pages. Wood's *Athen. Oxoniens*, and Granger's *Biog. Hist.*

not the attractions of personal satire and abuse, and his *Histriomastix*, like his other productions, would have been forgotten, if the prosecution of its author had not conferred on it fame and popularity. An information was exhibited against him by the attorney-general\*, and the cause was heard in the star-chamber. He was charged with having railed, in unbecoming language, at the diversions of the court, with having aspersed the queen, who was fond of these diversions, and with having bestowed commendation on several factious persons. The counsel for the defendant pleaded, that he had handled the argument of stage-plays in a learned manner, without designing to reflect on his superiors; that the book had been licensed according to law, and that, if any passages in it might be interpreted into a reflection on the king, the queen, or any branch of the government, the author expressed his contrition. The attorney-general aggravated the charge, and pronounced the *Histriomastix* to be a dangerous and malicious libel. After a full hearing before a crowded court, the delinquent was sentenced to have his book burned by the hands of the common hangman; to be incapacitated from practising as a barrister; to be deprived of his degree in the university of Oxford; to lose both his ears, after having stood in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside; to pay a fine of five thousand pounds, and to suffer perpetual imprisonment. Of all the lords of the star-chamber†, who delivered their judgment at large on the

A. D.  
1634.

Charles I.

Feb. 7.

\* Noy.

† They were lord Cottington, chief-justice Richardson, the earl of Dorset, and secretary Cooke. The earl of Dorset said,

CHAP.  
XXIV.

offence of Prynne, Laud was the most temperate; but he incurred the heaviest censure from the delinquent, and from the public.

A few months after, one Bastwick, a physician at Colchester, published a book, in which the English prelacy was assimilated to popery; and Burton, a clergyman of the city of London, printed two libellous sermons, for which their authors were fined and imprisoned until they submitted to a recantation.

These three delinquents, members of the professions of law, physic, and divinity, employed their hours of confinement in continuing their libellous attacks on those whom they considered as the authors of their punishment. Bastwick printed, with his own name prefixed, a pamphlet, called "the New Litany;" Prynne published anonymously, "a Divine Tragedy, containing a Catalogue of God's Judgments against Sabbath-breakers;" and Burton edited another anonymous tract, entitled "News from Ipswich," being a scurrilous attack on Wren, bishop of Norwich.

1637.  
June 30.

For these second offences, they were all cited into the star-chamber, and the defendants, instead of attempting to excuse their conduct, drew up an answer which no counsel could be prevailed on to sign. After a patient hearing, in the presence of an unusually large number of judges, they were unanimously pronounced guilty. Burton was sen-

"Mr. Prynne, I declare you to be a schism-maker in the church, a seditious sower in the state, a wolf in sheep's clothing, in a word, *omnium malorum nequissimus*. You are so far from being a social soul, that you are not even a rational soul." Rushworth's Collect. vol. ii.

tenced to be deprived of his benefice, and to be degraded from holy orders, as Prynne and Burton had already been degraded in their respective faculties. Each was fined in the sum of five thousand pounds, was sentenced to stand in the pillory, and to lose both his ears. Though this last punishment had been already inflicted on Prynne, yet he suffered a fresh mutilation, and was branded on both cheeks. They were condemned to imprisonment for life, in the most remote prisons of the kingdom, and one was sent to the castle of Launceston, another to the castle of Lancaster, and a third to the castle of Caernarvon. But these places being frequented by visitors, who came to offer condolence, Prynne was removed to Jersey, Burton to Guernsey, and Bastwick to Saint Mary's castle, in the isle of Scilly. In this state of close imprisonment, they were denied the use of pen and ink, and all access by their friends.

A. D.

Charles I.

Such a punishment, equally ignominious and cruel, was received with disgust: these three men were never objects of esteem; but their sufferings rendered them objects of pity, and they were regarded by the puritans, not as criminals, but as confessors\*. At the time when the sentence of the court was passed, Laud made an elaborate speech, in which he vindicated, not only his conduct on this particular occasion, but his whole ecclesiastical administration, and this speech was afterwards printed by the king's command.

In this instance, and in similar cases, Laud chiefly incurred the resentment of the open ene-

\* Granger's Biographical History, vol. ii.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

mies of the church, or of its disaffected members; but in other measures of his ecclesiastical government, he divided the conformists against him. No accusation was urged against him with more vehemence than that of introducing into the celebration of divine worship, a degree of pomp and splendour inconsistent with Christian simplicity. One of his innovations, as they were commonly styled, revived a controversy which had never been entirely extinct, and caused a schism even among the prelates. In compliance with the canons of the church, and the injunctions of Elizabeth, as well as in conformity to primitive custom, the communion table in the royal chapel, and in most cathedral and collegiate churches, stood at the eastern end of the chancel, or choir. This part was separated from the rest of the church by a rail, and thus guarded from common approach, and the communicants were enjoined to come up there at the celebration of the eucharist. This decent observance, for such it undoubtedly was, had been disregarded or contemned in many parish churches, and a departure from canonical injunction was countenanced and defended. When, therefore, Laud attempted to bring all the churches within his province to an uniformity on this point, he was assailed by vulgar clamour, and systematic attack. He was accused of bringing back the altar, and the host, and all the superstitions of popery.

Among the prelates opposed to Laud on this point, of the place and name of the holy table, Williams, at that time bishop of Lincoln, and dean of Westminster, was the most dangerous. This prelate possessed great natural abilities, improved

by intense application; but as his application had been distracted by different studies, he was not eminent in any: in theology he was a sciolist, and in law an empyric. Through the patronage of Buckingham he had been promoted, not only to a bishopric, but to the chancellorship, and was the last ecclesiastic who held the great seal. In this situation he was both unacceptable and inefficient, for all his decrees were reversed: and he exercised his office rather for the display of his own talents than for public utility. Before the death of James, he had declined in the favour of Buckingham, had been dispossessed of the chancellorship, and had retired to his episcopal palace at Buckden. There, like other disappointed courtiers, he professed patriotism and courted popularity; and puritanism was at this time on the side of both. Against Laud he entertained an implacable enmity, and it has been said a just resentment; and a desire of revenge on the primate, prompted him to join the non-conformists. From some parts of ecclesiastical discipline he could not, without the most palpable tergiversation, express dissent: so high was his admiration of the liturgy, that he had caused a translation of it to be made into the Spanish language; so great was his love of the choral service, that he had established a choir in the chapel of his own palace\*. But on the situation of the holy table he had probably never declared himself, and without any danger of incurring a charge of inconsistency, a favourable opportunity presented itself of opposing his rival. When the

A. D.  
1636.

Charles I.

\* Hacket's Life of Williams.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

injunctions of Laud were promulgated, he published a tract \* abounding in wit and satire, but deficient in solid argument, and gained a reputation by this treatise, which enabled him to execute greater mischief. He insinuated, that the archbishop aimed at more material changes than the situation of the holy table, and he was anxious to impress a belief that Laud was his personal enemy. His insinuations on the first point, however groundless, were greedily received, and on the last point were unhappily founded on truth. Whatever might have been the faults of Williams, yet his prosecution and punishment bear hard on the gratitude of Laud. Williams had imprudently said, that the puritans were the king's best subjects, and that the king had declared his intention of treating them with greater lenity than formerly. These expressions being reported to Laud, he caused an information against Williams to be lodged in the star-chamber; but this charge not being supported, another information was preferred with more success, for tampering with the king's witnesses. On this charge Williams was convicted, and he was sentenced to be suspended from all his preferments, amerced in a heavy fine, and to be imprisoned during the king's pleasure. His property was sold to pay the fine, his library was seized, and all his papers were subjected to a rigid scrutiny. Among his papers were found some letters which supplied materials for a fresh accusation; that of divulging libels to the prejudice of the king's counsellors, and particularly of the archbishop of Canterbury. On no

\* Holy Altar, Name and Thing.



other evidence than these letters of doubtful interpretation, he was convicted a second time, his fine was more than doubled, and from incapacity of payment he suffered a long and close imprisonment\*. Osbaldiston, a prebendary of Westminster, was implicated in this last charge against Williams; but, to avoid the ignominious punishment awarded to him, escaped by flight. On his desk was left a paper with these words: "If the archbishop inquire for me, tell him that I am gone beyond Canterbury."

A. D.  
1637.  
Charles I.

By these violent proceedings of Laud, there was arrayed against him the whole body of separatists, and a large portion of the established clergy. He engaged in other measures which, though not tinctured with cruelty, partook of ambition, and showed a disposition to aggrandize the church at the hazard of civil liberty. It was his aim to bring a great part of the business of Westminster-hall into the ecclesiastical courts, and in his desire gradually to introduce the canon and civil law, he might be said to imitate the Romish priesthood. The civilians and common lawyers had been always opposed to each other, and the prohibitions of the king's courts had always been resisted by the spiritual courts. But Laud, to preserve an equilibrium between these conflicting interests, prevailed on the king to direct that half the masters in chancery, and all the masters of the court of requests, should be civilians. This erroneous policy disgusted a learned and powerful body, who were more capable of injuring

\* He was imprisoned four years, and at last released by the long parliament. Fuller's Church History, b. 55.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

the church in its secular possessions, than the church of injuring them in their practice\*.

1636.  
June 21.

The archbishop was equally intent on the maintenance of his metropolitanical jurisdiction over the two universities, claiming a right of visitation on the privilege of his see, whereas the universities pleaded that the right was vested solely in the king. The case was heard in council, and it was by the king himself decided, that the archbishop, in right of his metropolitanical church of Canterbury, had power to visit his whole province, in which the universities are situate; they were therefore under his power, like the rest of his province, unless they could show privilege or exemption. They could not be exempted by any papal bull, and they were not exempted by any of their charters. The rights of the metropolitan trenched not on the rights of the crown, the object of metropolitanical visitation being to inquire into the conformity of the universities to the doctrine and discipline of the church of England †.

The ecclesiastical administration of Laud was rendered more odious by the indulgence shown towards the papists, an indulgence supposed to be shown by his recommendation, or at least his connivance. They were become a profitable part of the revenue, without any probable danger of being made a sacrifice to the law; since they were absolved from the severest parts of the law, and dispensed with the gentlest ‡. They were looked upon as good

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. ii.

† Collier's Eccl. Hist. from Laud's Register.

‡ Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i.

subjects at court, and good neighbours in the country. But they were not prudent managers of their prosperity, being elated with the favour and protection which they received. Though their numbers increased not, yet their pomp and boldness did to such a degree, that, as if they affected to be thought dangerous to the state, they appeared more publicly, and urged conferences with the protestants more avowedly than had been known before. They attempted to gain, and sometimes succeeded in gaining, weak and uninformed ladies, with such circumstances as provoked the rage and destroyed the charity of great and powerful families. An agent from Rome resided in London in great splendour, publicly visited the court, and was openly acknowledged and consulted by Roman catholics of all conditions\*. Some of them were promoted to places of the highest honour and trust; the earl of Portland was lord treasurer, lord Cottington chancellor of the exchequer, and Windesbank secretary of state.

A. D.  
1637.  
Charles I.

Panzani, the pope's agent, to strengthen the interest of the Romanists, applied to that part of the ministry which belonged to the Romish communion, for an English bishop to exercise his functions. To give a more favourable impression to this unconstitutional request, it was proposed that the bishop should be nominated by the king, and limited by the king in the exercise of his episcopal office. On this request two queries were demanded of Panzani: First, whether the pope would allow the nomination of a bishop, who held the oath of

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

allegiance a lawful engagement; and, secondly, whether the pope would permit the English Roman catholics to take the oath? No satisfaction could be obtained on either of these queries, and the request of Panzani was met by a denial.

Con, or Cunæus, a native of Scotland, succeeded Panzani, and by his dexterity and address insinuated himself into the favourable opinion of the ministry. Though Laud refused to admit the papal agent even to a visit of ceremony, yet he was aspersed in libels as an encourager of the mass, and the pope's pensioner. His vindication of his conduct at the council table, and his tardy though sincere endeavours to suppress the progress of popery, only served to incense the queen against him, without removing any portion of public calumny.

Looking at the composition of the English ministry, it must be confessed that the representations of the puritans had some reason. The great offices of the state were in the hands of papists or ecclesiastics; and when, in the place of the earl of Portland, Juxon, bishop of London, was appointed high treasurer, the alliance of popery and prelacy was thought to be evidently established. The nobility were indignant at such a promotion, and began to look on the church as a gulf ready to swallow up all the offices of civil government\*. In the mean time Laud applauded himself as the adviser of the measure, and fallaciously thought that it conferred strength on the church†.

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion.

† Laud's Diary. See Bishop Warburton's Remarks on Neal.

Under these inauspicious circumstances, Charles A. D. prosecuted an object which he had long contemplated, that of bringing Scotland to an entire uniformity with the English church. When he left Scotland after his coronation, he committed to the bishops of that kingdom the task of framing a liturgy and canons. Two years had elapsed before the Scottish bishops had made any progress in the work, and they inverted the natural course of proceeding by completing a code of ecclesiastical law before a liturgy. As soon as the canons were framed they were transmitted to England, and were referred by the king to Laud, Juxon, and Wren, bishop of Norwich\*. After some alterations in the canons, alterations sanctioned by the Scottish bishops, the royal approbation was given, and notified by a proclamation.

---

Charles I.

It was a fatal inadvertence, that these canons were never submitted to the general assembly of the kirk of Scotland ; it was an unpardonable error that they were not communicated even to the Scottish privy council ; since it was impossible that a new code of ecclesiastical law could be introduced without affecting the government of the state. Laud constantly pressed these considerations on the Scottish bishops ; he told them that it was their duty to provide that the proposed canons were not contrary to the ancient laws of Scotland, which neither himself nor his brethren

\* He was remarkably conversant in the discipline and liturgies of the Greek and Latin churches, and rigidly exacted conformity. A strict observance of rites and ceremonies was called by the puritans, " practising Wren's fancies." Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

could be supposed to understand. With equal prudence, he advised that the canons should never be put in execution without the consent and approbation of the Scottish privy council. But this wise advice was neglected, and the canons were never submitted to any other examination than that which they had undergone in England.

Not less strange and inconsiderate was the design of publishing the canons before the liturgy was prepared, when the observance of the liturgy was enjoined in several of their canons. Whereas, if the liturgy had been first published, they might both have experienced a more favourable reception.

When the canons were made public, it was discovered, that so far from being confined to the church, and to religious matters, they left no part of the civil government uninvaded, and no class of persons untouched, and perhaps uninjured. The first canon conceded such an unlimited power and prerogative to be in the king, and such a full supremacy in all ecclesiastical causes, as had never been pretended by any of their former sovereigns, nor acknowledged by their laity or clergy; another canon enacted, that no ecclesiastical person should become a surety; a third, that all bishops and other clerks, who died without children, should be obliged to give a certain portion of their estates to the church. Regulations of this kind were not only novel, but impolitic, and an infringement on civil liberty: the suggestion was, therefore, not unfounded, that the king intended to impose on his Scottish subjects an entirely new form of government in the church and state.

The seeds of jealousy were thus sown, and pro-

duced such fruit as might be expected in a soil so well prepared for their growth. The liturgy, after it had been sent from Scotland and perused by the three English bishops, was approved and confirmed by the king, and appointed to be read in all the churches. In this case there was the same undesigned or premeditated omission as had taken place in the preparation and publication of the canons. The clergy were not consulted in an affair which so nearly concerned them, and some of the bishops were not acquainted with it. The privy council had no other notice than was given to the kingdom at large. A notice of a single week was thought sufficient to announce, that on the next Sunday the liturgy should be read in the churches, not only of Edinburgh, but of all Scotland.

A. D.  
1637.  
Charles I.

The royal proclamation, which had enjoined the liturgy to be first read on Easter day, was disobeyed by the advice of the earl of Traquair, and the matter was delayed till the beginning of summer. On the day appointed, the archbishops, several of the bishops, the lords of the session, and the magistracy of the city, assembled in the cathedral of Edinburgh. The dean began to read the service; but scarcely had he commenced, when a violent clamour was raised, and his voice was inaudible: to this uproar succeeded a shower of stones and other missiles directed against the reader. The bishop ascended the pulpit, and reminded the people of the sanctity of the place, of their duty to God and the king, but he could scarcely obtain a hearing, and the clamour was continued without abatement. The chancellor commanded the pro-

July 23.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

---

vost and bailiffs of the city to descend from the gallery, in which they sat, and to suppress the riot. It was with no small difficulty that the magistrates restored a comparative tranquillity by extruding the most disorderly part of the congregation, and by closing the doors. But when the dean a second time began the service, it could not be heard ; for the uproar was kept up on the outside, and the people broke the windows, and endeavoured to force an entrance.

Defeated in this renewed attempt to celebrate divine service, the ecclesiastical and civil authorities returned from the church, and the multitude followed the bishops with the most opprobrious language. Not satisfied with revilings, they assaulted the bishop of Edinburgh, and treated him with such violence, that, after having his habit torn, he with difficulty escaped into a private house. The clergy who read the liturgy in the other churches experienced similar outrage ; they were pursued with bitter execrations against popery and prelacy.

As yet no person of condition appeared to countenance these seditious tumults, yet not one of the insurgents was apprehended. The council despatched an express to the king, with a full account of all the late transactions, and until the return of his answer suspended the use of the liturgy. An answer from the king was soon received, expressing his displeasure at the supineness of the government, with an injunction to act with vigour in vindication of the royal authority. But if the council had inclined to more energetic measures, the time was past when they could be adopted



with safety. The people pursued their plans with prudence and constancy; and it was soon found that many of the higher orders encouraged the opposition, and that the majority of the clergy was hostile to episcopal government, and all prescribed forms of worship. Women of the highest quality declared in favour of the dissentients, and joined in the clamour against the bishops, as being the abettors of tyranny and superstition. A bishop could not be seen in the streets without danger, and when the king's answer arrived, scarcely a single prelate remained in Edinburgh\*.

A. D.  
1637.  
Charles I.

During the summer, the disturbances were confined to Edinburgh; but when the harvest was ended, the people from the country flocked to the capital in great numbers, in a cause which, they thought, concerned their salvation. Proclamations were immediately issued for the dispersion of the multitude, but these orders were treated with the utmost contempt. The doors of the council house were surrounded, and the people refused to disperse until the council had promised to intercede with the king for the abolition of the liturgy.

Having shown that they were not afraid to express their feelings by strong remonstrance, the Scottish presbyterians adopted the tone of supplication. Two petitions were presented to the lord chancellor and council against the liturgy: one in the name of all the men, women, children, and servants of Edinburgh; the other, in the name of the noblemen, barons, gentry, ministers, and burghesses.

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. b. 2. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 6.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

Feb. 19.

The petitions were transmitted to England; but the king, instead of returning a conciliatory answer, published a proclamation, prohibiting all assemblies or convocations of the people for the purpose of framing or signing petitions, on pain of high treason; but at the same time he declared, that he would not shut his ears to any petition, if neither its form nor matter was prejudicial to his authority.

Such a proclamation, it might be supposed, could not restore tranquillity: on the contrary, it called forth a protest, signed by several noblemen, clergymen, and citizens, stating, that the king's Scottish subjects had an undoubted right to assemble for the purpose of petitioning; that archbishops and bishops ought not to sit in any judicatory, ecclesiastical or civil, till they had expurgated themselves from the crimes alleged against them; that neither the petitioners nor their adherents ought to incur penalties for resisting canons and a liturgy which had never been confirmed by the parliament or the general assembly; that if any tumults had arisen the petitioners were not culpable; and that all their proceedings had no other tendency than to preserve the true reformed religion, and the laws and liberties of the realm.

The council, apprehensive of danger from these large assemblies and combinations of the people, agreed, that if they would peaceably return to their homes, they should be allowed to appoint representatives, who might remain in Edinburgh till the king's answer to their protest was made known. Accordingly, four tables or classes were formed, severally representing the nobility, the clergy, the

gentry, and the burgesses. From each of these tables commissioners were appointed, constituting a general table or supreme board, which controlled and determined the proceedings of the four subordinate classes. Being thus organized, the tables assumed the functions of government; and whenever the council, or the king himself, issued a proclamation for the preservation of the public peace, the tables published a counter-protest with as much confidence, and with the same formality, as if all the powers of the realm had been vested in their hands. The council removed its session, first to Linlithgow and then to Stirling, whereas the tables held their meetings in the capital of Scotland.

A. D.  
1638.  
Charles I.

The first business of these tables was the renewal of THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT, originally subscribed by James the Sixth and his family. The instrument prepared by the tables widely differed from the original engagement; but under the impression that it was the same, it was eagerly subscribed. In the original covenant there was a general band for the maintenance of true religion and the king's person; in the covenant prepared by the tables was added a recital of different acts of parliament ratified since the subscription of James, with an admonition, wherein the late innovations were renounced, and a band of adherence in the present cause.

Under the pretext that it was the same covenant which had been taken by James, it was subscribed with great solemnity, first at Edinburgh, and afterward in the several counties. It was received by the people as a sacred oracle, as the safeguard of the protestant religion and of civil liberty.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

Advice of these proceedings of the covenanters was transmitted to England, and an intimation was given that the tumults were occasioned by a fear of innovation in the doctrine and discipline of the kirk, and by a general aversion to episcopacy. The council, therefore, advised that the canons and liturgy should not be enforced.

On receiving this communication, the marquis of Hamilton was sent into Scotland by the king, as his high commissioner, with instructions to consent to the suspending of the use of the liturgy; but at the same time to dissolve the tables, and to require a surrender of the covenant. The king added, that if there were not a sufficient force in Scotland to compel the covenanters to return to their allegiance, he would himself come from England with an army, and subdue their rebellious spirit.

The arrival of the marquis of Hamilton at Holyrood-house was welcomed by the covenanters of all ranks; but when the nature of his instructions was made known, the disposition of the people was changed. The clergy exhorted their flocks not to listen to ensnaring propositions; and a letter was sent to Hamilton, advising him and the council to take the covenant. A negotiation was for some time carried on with the English court, without any agreement on its preliminaries. On the one hand, the king would never consent to call a general assembly, or a parliament, until the covenant was surrendered or disavowed; on the other hand, both clergy and laity declared with one voice, that they would as soon renounce their baptism as their covenant, but professed their general allegiance to

the king, and their resolution to support him in the defence of true religion, and of the laws and liberties of the nation. Hamilton, unable to make any impression on the covenanters, returned in sorrow to England.

A. D.  
1638.  
Charles I.

After an interval had elapsed, Hamilton was sent back with instructions, if necessity required, to revoke the canons, to abolish the liturgy, and also the court of high commission. He had a farther authority to subscribe the confession of faith, and the annexed band of defence subscribed by king James, and to require subscription from all the king's subjects. It was then that the imposition and artifice of the covenanters were fully discovered. The band of the original covenant implied the defence and continuance of episcopacy, for that was the existing constitution of the church. It contained no promise of mutual defence and assistance against all persons whatsoever, a promise which might be used to arm the covenanters against the king himself. The covenanters therefore declined to subscribe the original covenant, which they said was to subscribe again, and were contented with returning thanks to the king for annulling the canons, abolishing the liturgy and court of high commission.

At length Hamilton published a proclamation for a general assembly to meet at Glasgow. The election of its members was throughout favourable to the covenanters. Alexander Henderson, one of the contumacious ministers, was chosen its moderator; and another, named Johnston, the clerk registrar. Nov. 25.

The bishops presented a declinator, declaring

CHAP.  
XXIV.

the assembly unlawful, and the members of it not qualified to represent the clergy of the nation. Their grounds of objecting to its authority were: because the members had been chosen before the presbyteries had received the royal mandate to proceed to election; because most of them had not subscribed the articles of religion, nor sworn an acknowledgment of the king's supremacy; because they had excluded the bishops who, by the ecclesiastical constitution, were the moderators of the presbyteries; because there were lay elders among them who had no right to be present; and because it was contrary to the practice of the Christian church, that archbishops and bishops should be judged by a mixed assembly of clerks and laics.

The declinator of the bishops, having been read, was unanimously rejected, and a committee was appointed to frame an answer. Though Hamilton had given a tacit acknowledgment of the legality of the assembly by presiding in it for seven days, yet, despairing of any good issue from its longer continuance, he determined, in compliance with his instructions, to dissolve it. For this purpose, he went to the church where the assembly held its sittings, and read the concessions which the king was willing to make; but these, though considerable\*, were far below the demands of the cove-

\* He declaimed against lay elders, who were unknown in the government of the church for the first fifteen centuries, such persons being very unfit to judge of the high mysteries of predestination, ante and post lapsarian doctrines, or to pass sentence upon their superiors in learning and office. He therefore advised the assembly to break up and proceed to a new election. Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 7.

nanter. Nothing less would satisfy them than the dissolution of the episcopal order, and a redress of all grievances. The concessions therefore being rejected, Hamilton dissolved the assembly, forbidding the members to meet synodically, on pain of high treason; and on the next day the dissolution was proclaimed in the city.

A. D.  
1638.

Charles I.

Nov. 28.

Instead of submitting to the royal command, the assembly met on the next day, and published a protestation, affirming that lay elders had constantly sat in the assembly before episcopal government had excluded them; and that the presence of the king's commissioner was not essential to the legality of the general assembly of the church. By the doctrine and discipline of the kirk, and by the constitution of its different presbyteries, it was equally unlawful and unchristian for the king to dissolve it, or even to stay its proceedings. That the assembly had continued to sit, notwithstanding any countermand, was evident from its records. In the present case, to dissolve it before any grievances were redressed, was to promote rebellion, or induce despair. For these reasons it was declared lawful to continue the assembly, till an examination had been instituted into past evils and their causes, and till a provision had been made for the future maintenance of religious truth. It was finally declared, that the assembly should be esteemed a full and free convention, and that its acts, sentences, and censures should be obeyed by all the subjects of the kingdom.

Nov. 29.

According to this protestation, the assembly continued its sittings during several weeks, and in that period effected an entire revolution of the

1639.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

ecclesiastical polity. Episcopacy was abolished and abjured ; and together with it, the subordinate dignities of deans and archdeacons. Sentence of deposition was formally pronounced against all the Scottish bishops, eight of whom were excommunicated, four were incapacitated from their ministerial functions, and only two were permitted to officiate as presbyters or pastors. Spotswood, archbishop of Saint Andrew's, and chancellor of Scotland, retired to London, where he soon died, and most of his brethren followed him to England. Only four remained in their own country, three of whom renounced the episcopal character, and the only prelate who had courage to maintain his ground was Guthrey, bishop of Murray.

When the assembly had finished its work, it framed an address to the king, complaining of his high commissioner, because he had proclaimed its members liable to the penalties of high treason, and had forbidden obedience to its acts. But this was not all. An address was published to all the people of England, inviting them to follow the example ; and, to strengthen their party, the covenanters employed an agent\* in London, to draw the English non-conformists into a confederacy.

On this open defiance of the government, Hamilton left Scotland ; and the king not only suppressed the inflammatory address of the covenanters, but issued a proclamation against them, which he commanded to be read in all the churches of England.

Feb. 20. In conformity with the advice of the English

\* This agent was Eleazar Borthwick, a presbyterian minister.



council, of which Laud was at the head, the king declared his intention of raising an army, and of commanding it in person. The treasury was in a flourishing state, and a war with the Scots was not unpopular. It was warmly supported by the episcopal clergy; it was unhappily supported by the queen and her popish adherents. The courtiers and the country gentlemen gave liberal contributions; and in a short time Charles saw a fleet manned, and a considerable army ready to take the field\*.

A. D.  
1639.  
Charles I.

The Scots, being acquainted with these military preparations, secured the important fortresses of Edinburgh and Dumbarton; they raised an army of volunteers, devoted to the cause of presbyterianism, and ready to die in its defence; they sent for their veteran general, Lesley, to command it; who was then in Germany, but who with alacrity obeyed the call.

The earl of Arundel was appointed commander-in-chief of the English army; a man who was thought to be selected for his negative qualities. He did not love the Scots; he did not love the puritans: which qualifications were alloyed by another negative, he did not much love any one else†. The earl of Essex, the darling of the people, was made lieutenant-general; and the earl of Holland, a worth-

\* According to Clarendon, an army of six thousand horse, about the same number of foot, besides three thousand embarked in the fleet. This makes the amount only fifteen thousand; but other historians have stated the whole army to consist of twenty-one thousand.

† Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. b. 2.

CHAP. less courtier, and a creature of the queen, was com-  
XXIV. mander of the horse.

With this army, abundantly supplied with a train of artillery, the king advanced towards the borders of Scotland. The fleet, commanded by Hamilton, was intended to impede the trade of Scotland, and, if possible, to make a descent on its coast; and three thousand soldiers were embarked in it, to join, at a convenient opportunity, the main army.

The earl of Essex, with a detachment both of horse and foot, advanced with all possible expedition before the main army, to possess the important border-fortress of Berwick; and if the war had been now vigorously pursued, it would have been almost as soon ended as begun. But no sooner was Charles advertised that Berwick was in possession of the earl of Essex, than, instead of following with his army, he summoned his nobility to attend him at York. The court, composed as it was of a nobility intriguing, pusillanimous, or disaffected, would have remained, with more advantage to the king's interests, in London. By such counsellors Charles was persuaded, instead of hazarding a battle, to submit to a treaty. He advanced beyond Berwick, and it was now seen that he had provided an expensive armament solely to conclude an inglorious and insecure pacification. The Scots petitioned for this treaty; but they offered no submission; they justified their past proceedings, and demanded exemplary punishment on those counsellors who had misrepresented them to the king\*.

June 17.

\* Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. b. 2.

The most important matters of the treaty were discussed in a conference, and not committed to writing; and even of the written part there was a great difference in the interpretation \*. But it was agreed that the disputed points should be settled in Scotland by a general assembly and a parliament. It was the intention of Charles to have presided in the former, if not in the latter; but when the time arrived for the meeting of the assembly, he contented himself with sending his commissioner, the earl of Traquair. The bishops were excused from attendance, or rather were advised not to attend, by letters from the king, and the king also yielded to the demands of the kirk, that lay elders might be eligible.

A. D.  
1639.

Charles I.

Aug. 12.

Thus constituted, the assembly, with the acquiescence, if not the assent, of Traquair, confirmed the dubious authority of the synod of Glasgow. It enacted that the covenant should be taken throughout Scotland, and promulged such an interpretation of the bond of defence as vindicated the late proceedings of the Scottish nation. With one consent it resolved that diocesan episcopacy was unscriptural and unlawful, and not to be tolerated in the kirk.

Not long after the assembly, the Scottish parliament met; and, having first subscribed the covenant, confirmed all the acts which the general as-

\* Ibid. One of the tenets of the covenanters was, that if a law be interpreted by the government in a sense disliked by the majority of the people, for whose benefit the law was made, such a construction may be fairly over-ruled. See the king's Declaration, written by Balcanqual, in Guthrey's Memoirs.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

sembly had passed. In addition, it erected a third estate of lords or barons, in the room of the bishops, and concluded by declaring episcopacy unlawful. At this stage of the proceedings, the commissioner refused the royal assent, and prorogued the parliament, at first for fourteen days, and then till the next spring\*. None of the parliamentary acts were ratified, and two of the Scottish peers† being sent to London to solicit the royal assent, were dismissed with a severe reprimand, and scarcely admitted into the king's presence.

To give an effectual check to the doctrines of the Scottish covenanters, Hall, then bishop of Exeter, composed a treatise on the divine right of episcopacy; and, to prevent the Scots from supporting their doctrines by arms, Wentworth was recalled from Ireland. It was determined by the English council to set aside the pacification, and to renew the war. But the armament of the last year had drained the treasury of its accumulated wealth, and the revenues of the crown had been anticipated. To raise another army without money was impossible, and to provide money was impossible without summoning a parliament. The long intermission of parliaments had disinclined the king to relieve his wants by this constitutional method; but his urgent necessities overcame his antipathy. The Scots had applied to the king of France for assistance in their projected hostilities, which they threatened to bring within the English border.

\* Nalson's Collections, and Dr. Z. Grey's Examination of Neal.

† The earl of Dumfermline and lord Loudon.

Charles, therefore, fondly expected that a parliament, forgetful of its just resentments, forgetful of the encroachments of the royal prerogative on the liberties of the people, would cordially unite with the king in a defence of their common country.

A. D.  
1640.  

---

Charles I.

In the interval between the sealing of the writs and the meeting of the parliament, the lord-keeper Coventry died, and the loss was felt more sensibly, by the appointment of sir John Finch as his successor. Finch had long filled the situation of chief justice in the court of common pleas, and was generally obnoxious, for asserting the legality of ship-money, and of those other oppressive imposts which had been levied by the royal authority during the last twelve years.

The two houses met, with the ancient, though not accustomed formalities; for through long disuse they had been almost forgotten. The king having ungraciously expressed his desire of renewing his acquaintance with parliaments after so long an intermission, referred the cause of his convening the present parliament, to be explained and enlarged on by the lord-keeper. Had the lord-keeper possessed that conciliatory manner which the king wanted, the reference might have been prudent; but Finch had as little courtesy as Charles himself. After a succinct relation of the mutinous conduct of the Scots, he bluntly said, that the king did not expect their advice, still less did he wish their mediation, but desired that they would, as speedily as possible, grant such a supply as was required for the vindication of his honour. He assured them, that if they would gratify the king in this matter, he would allow ample time for their representation

**CHAP. XXIV.** of grievances, and would give to their complaints a favourable consideration \*.

It was contrary to custom to enter on any business of importance during the first fortnight; but that custom was disregarded. Scarcely had the parliament sat a week, when the court, impatient at the delay of the supplies, prevailed on the house of lords to demand a conference with the commons. At this conference the lords assumed the privilege of advising the commons to begin by granting a supply, and afterwards to proceed to the redress of grievances. Though this suggestion was merely a repetition of the advice of the lord-keeper, yet when it was reported in the house, the feeling of the commons was warmly expressed. It was resolved that the conduct of the lords was a high breach of privilege, and that the commons would not proceed on any other business till the indignity had been acknowledged and repaired. The lords, sensible of their error, acknowledged the privileges of the commons as fully as they were demanded, and requested that the lower house would arrange the business according to its own discretion.

Such a reparation, though complete, was pretended to be unsatisfactory by those who had no inclination to accommodate the difference, and who made use of it as a pretext for withholding the supplies. Several days were consumed in searching precedents, and in preparing a protestation to be entered on the journals of both houses. After the expiration of some days, the king devised

\* Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. b. 2.

another expedient to quicken the tardiness of the commons. He sent a written message by sir Henry Vane, secretary of state, and treasurer of the household, taking notice that a misunderstanding between the two houses had impeded the discussion of the most important affairs of the kingdom, at a time when a foreign army was ready to invade it. He had heard that ship-money was considered by his people as an oppressive impost, though it had been adjudged legal; therefore he proposed, as a manifestation of his good will to his subjects, to release his title and claim to it, if the parliament would grant twelve subsidies, to be paid in three years, and in due proportions.

A. D.  
1640.  
Charles I.

Though exceptions, in point of privilege, might have been taken to this message, because the king had taken notice of a difference between the two houses, yet the commons resolved to take it into immediate consideration. The debates were protracted during two or three days, and the popular members endeavoured to embarrass the question; yet the dexterity with which the courtiers counteracted the patriots would probably have succeeded; but the treachery of sir Henry Vane, and of Herbert, the solicitor-general, defeated this favourable adjustment. These two counsellors, and these only\*, prevailed so far with the king, that he hastily sent for the speaker, and commanded the attendance of the commons on that day in the house of lords. This command being obeyed, the lord-keeper, by the king's command, dissolved the parliament.

May 5.

The convocation, which assembled concurrently

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. b. 2.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

April 4.

with the parliament, was opened with great solemnity. After the sermon, the reading of the king's writ, and the choice of a prolocutor \*, the archbishop produced a commission under the great seal, enabling the two houses to alter the canons already in force, or to make new, as should be most convenient for the government of the church. The commission was to remain in force during the session of parliament, and no longer; and, by a remarkable clause, nothing could be done unless the archbishop was made a party in the consultation.

Several canons had been already made, when the parliament was unexpectedly dissolved, and, according to ancient custom, the convocation was dissolved with it. The archbishop would probably have formally pronounced its dissolution on the next day, if a member of the lower house had not adduced a solitary precedent for the continuance of its session. The case in point happened in the reign of Elizabeth, when the kingdom was menaced by an invasion of Spain; and, in this instance, the convocation, after the rising of parliament, granted a liberal subsidy, to meet the exigencies of the state. It was thence inferred that the convocation was not only distinct from, but independent of, the parliament; and the archbishop prorogued the two houses, until the question had been submitted to the highest legal authorities.

May 14.

The case having been thus referred to the law officers, the majority delivered an opinion †, “that

\* Dr. Steward, dean of Chichester, and clerk of the closet.

† Signed by Finch, lord-keeper; Manchester, lord privy-seal; Littleton, chief-justice of the common pleas; Banks, at-



the convocation, being called by the king's writ under the great seal, does continue till it be dissolved by writ or commission under the great seal, notwithstanding the parliament be dissolved." Fortified by such an authority, the convocation re-assembled; but some members of the lower house, to the number of thirty-six \*, protested earnestly, though not in due form, against the continuance of the session. They did not withdraw, nor did they cause their protest to be recorded; because a message from the king, communicated by the secretary of state, commanded that none of the members should withdraw till the whole business of the convocation had been completed.

A. D.  
1640.  
Charles I.

Upon this foundation rested the legality of this convocation; but, firm as it appeared, the populace were so highly incensed at its continuance, that, after having unsuccessfully attacked the palace of Lambeth, they resolved to besiege the convocation-house. Under the protection of a guard provided by the king, the convocation resumed its sittings; the canons were passed †; and six subsidies ‡, to be paid in six years, were granted for the supply of the king's wants. After the business was ended, the archbishop dissolved the convocation by a special mandate, or writ, under the great seal.

As soon as the canons were promulgated, fresh torney-general; and Whitfield and Heath, two of the king's counsel.

\* Fuller's Church History, b. 9. Among those who protested were Drs. Brownrigg, Hacket, Holdsworth, and Mr. Warmistre.

† They were transmitted to the convocation at York, and there passed without debate.

‡ About 120,000*l*.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

discontents arose. In the first of these canons the regal power was asserted to be of divine right, and passive obedience was strongly inculcated. Many of these canons were levelled against papists, Socinians, and sectarists\*; and some were made to restrain the power of lay-chancellors, and the abuse of excommunication. These last grievances had been a fruitful source of puritanical complaint; but the present remedy could not render the other canons palatable to the sectarists, while the civilians were exasperated by this diminution of their privileges.

The most popular objection against the canons, which was used to invalidate their legality, was against the insertion of an oath in the sixth canon, entitled “An oath for the preventing all innovations in doctrine and government.” It was contended that the convocation had not the power of imposing an oath, even on its own members; that the present oath was loosely, and perhaps ensnaringly worded; and that it precluded any alterations, however necessary or beneficial, in the existing establishment.

These were not captious difficulties, raised by non-conformists; but they were sincerely entertained by multitudes of churchmen, not only of the factious, but of the loyal. Sanderson, whose great abilities could not be concealed, even in the obscurity of a country parish, communicated these difficulties to the archbishop. “The peace of the

\* The canons were passed with the single dissenting voice of Goodman, bishop of Gloucester. The archbishop told him that no one could object, unless he were a papist, a Socinian, or a puritan. Goodman proved to be the first.

church," he added, "is apparently in more danger by this one occasion than by any thing that has happened in our memories \*." So highly objectionable did the oath appear, that a relaxation of it was afterwards enjoined by the king himself †, and the moderate prelates forbore to press it on their clergy.

A. D.  
1640.  
Charles I.

When the king, by his abrupt dissolution of the parliament, had precluded the possibility of receiving the necessary supplies, he resorted to his former expedients of raising money; and his success exceeded his most sanguine expectations. In less than three weeks a voluntary loan of three hundred thousand pounds was paid into the exchequer. The greatest diligence was used in recruiting the army; but in the appointment of its officers the evil genius of Charles prevailed. The earl of Essex, who had shown equal fidelity and courage in the last expedition, was unemployed; and the command was given to the earl of Northumberland, lord Conway, and Wentworth, now created earl of Strafford.

For a long time there had been a correspondence between the disaffected part of the English and the Scottish nobility; and the Scottish army was encouraged to advance beyond its border, and to bring the war into England. It passed the Tweed, and took possession of Newcastle, the royal army retreating as far as York, and leaving the enemy in possession of the three northern counties. As soon as the Scots entered Newcastle, they sent a message to the city of London, giving assurances

\* Nalson's Collections, p. 497.

† In a letter, addressed by sir H. Vane to Laud, dated from York, Sept. 30, 1640.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

that trade should not be interrupted, but that they would cultivate all manner of friendship and brotherly correspondence. They also sent messengers to the king, with an humble petition that he would confirm the late acts of their parliament, and call an English parliament to settle the peace of both kingdoms.

Conway having been defeated at Newburgh, and Strafford not venturing to hazard a battle, Charles resolved to summon his nobility at York, and in a more formal manner than in the last year. Writs were issued under the great seal, requiring the attendance of the peers; and on their first meeting, the king signified his intention of holding a parliament at Westminster. Forty days must necessarily elapse before it could assemble, and that interval was employed in a negotiation with the Scots. As soon as the council of peers met, a petition was presented, as respectful and submissive as could be expected from a victorious army; and the petition gave rise to the treaty of Rippon. The Scottish interest so far prevailed in the English court, that the commissioners for managing the treaty on the king's part were such peers as should not be "ungracious to the Scots." The commissioners on the other side were not all of high quality; there were only two noblemen, and the rest were gentlemen, artisans, and presbyterian ministers. Of this last class was Alexander Henderson, the unrelenting enemy of episcopacy.

After some debate, the English and Scottish commissioners agreed to a cessation of arms. The Scottish army was to be maintained until the treaty was concluded, and the contributions for their

support were to be raised in the counties of Northumberland, Westmoreland, Durham, and the town of Newcastle. The river Tees was to be the barrier to both armies, and the main articles of the treaty were to be adjusted in London \*.

A. D.  
1640.  
Charles I.

The removal of the treaty to London was highly gratifying to the Scots, and was one cause of the calamities which ensued. Their commissioners came thither in great state, and were received by the king with a show of complacency. A house in the city, usually inhabited by the lord-mayor, or one of the sheriffs, was allotted for their residence; and the church of St. Antholin was yielded for their devotions. The benefit of this accommodation to men who mingled religion with their politics had been foreseen. Henderson, who united the offices of chaplain and commissioner, had abundant scope for inculcating his political and religious creed. To hear the sermons of Henderson and his brethren, there was a conflux of all sorts: of the citizens out of factiousness, of others out of curiosity; and a few from a wish to justify their dislike to the presbyterian form of worship. On every Sunday, from the first appearance of daylight to its close, the church was never empty. Those who could procure admission kept their places till the evening exercise was finished; and those who were not so fortunate hung upon or about the windows, as spectators †.

While the Scottish commissioners were thus triumphantly settled in the metropolis of England,

\* Whitelock's Memoirs.

† Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. b. 3.

CHAP.  
XXIV.

---

a monthly payment of fifty thousand pounds was allowed for the subsistence of both armies. Strafford remained in the north, after the king and his court had repaired to London, to suppress the mutinous spirit of the English troops \*. The parliament was now to assemble; and to preserve themselves from its censure, or to gain its protection, was the business and solicitude of all.

Nov. 3.

\* Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. b. 2.

## CHAPTER XXV.

Opening of the Long Parliament.—Opening of Convocation.

—Committee of the House of Commons for the Redress of religious Grievances.—Release of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, and of Bishop Williams.—Fast appointed.—Censure of the late Acts of Convocation by the House of Commons.—Laud impeached by the Commons.—Complaints exhibited against other Prelates.—Laud sent to the Tower.—Churches defaced.—Liturgy decried.—Petitions against the Hierarchy.—Petition in its favour.—Ecclesiastical Administration of Williams.—He moves that the Bishops be excused from Attendance on Strafford's Trial.—His Advice to the King.—Bill against Deans and Chapters.—Bill for removing Bishops from Parliament.—Protestation.—Bishops impeached.—King's Journey into Scotland.—Irish Massacre.—Remonstrance of the Commons.—King's Answer.—Impeachment of the Bishops dropped, and consequent Tumults.—Prevented from Access to the House of Lords.—Their Protestation.—Their Imprisonment and Impeachment.—Bill passed for excluding them from Parliament receives the Royal Assent.

WITH a fearful anticipation of approaching calamity, the parliament was opened by Charles. Rightly he foreboded that a monster was ready to come forth at his call, which would not depart at his bidding, but would continue to haunt his steps and cross his path. But it was impossible now to retreat, although uncertain whither his course tended. His condition was the more deplorable, because he knew not where to look for advice and succour. His confidential servants were engrossed by fears for their own safety; and when he impru-

A. D.  
1640.

Charles I.  
Nov 3,

CHAP. dently recalled Strafford from the army, he only  
XXV. accelerated the ruin of a faithful minister, and lost  
his best support.

The king on this occasion came not to Westminster with his accustomed equipage and his proper state, but landed from his barge at the parliament stairs. In a critical affair, the choice of a speaker, he had experienced an unexpected disappointment, and he was induced to delay his appearance in the house till the afternoon. His speech was marked not by the gracious condescension of a monarch secure in the affections of his people, but by the language of irritable humiliation. He promised to concur in all measures for redressing just grievances, leaving to the parliament where to begin. But in his speech he made use of one expression which betrayed his want of equanimity, and the feelings which rankled in his mind. He styled the Scots rebels, at a time when a pacification subsisted between the two kingdoms, and when a treaty, on equal terms, was under discussion. The harsh and improper appellation was not unfelt; but on a subsequent day, when he had occasion to make another personal communication to the two houses, the offensive term was not softened or recalled, but repeated and justified.

Nov. 4. On the day following the meeting of parliament the convocation was opened with the usual solemnities. The former prolocutor was again chosen, and the archbishop, in a pathetic speech, adverted to the dangers impending on the church. He exhorted every individual present to perform the duty of his post with firmness, and not to be wanting to himself or to the cause of religion.



One of the proctors in the lower house\*, either through weakness, or conviction, or treachery, moved, that in order to cover the pit which they had opened, and to anticipate the censure of parliament, they should petition the king for a licence to review and annul the late canons. But the motion was decisively rejected, and the mover could not protect his character from the imputation of cowardice: disappointed in his attempt, he published his speech, and thereby justly incurred the additional stigma of disaffection to the ecclesiastical establishment. After disposing of this motion, the business of the convocation was at an end; and being deserted by its principal members, it broke up without adjournment or prorogation.

A. D.  
1640.  
Charles I.

At their first entrance on business, the house of commons appointed four grand committees. The first was to hear and determine grievances concerning religion, and it was subdivided into twenty or thirty different branches.

Among the earliest acts indicative of the disposition which prevailed in the house was the release of several prisoners who had been confined by order of the star chamber, the court of high commission, or the privy council. Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, were removed from the distant islands in which they had been exiled, and were conducted into London with the most triumphant acclamations. Williams, bishop of Lincoln, was restored to his liberty, reinstated in his deanery of Westminster, and pardoned his fines.

\* Warmistres, one of the proctors for the diocese of Worcester.



CHAP.  
XXV.

Nov. 18.

The two houses petitioned the king to appoint a fast, that they might implore the divine blessing on their councils. The bishops of Durham and Carlisle preached before the lords in Westminster Abbey; one of these prelates being a courtier, and the other a favourer of puritanism\*. The preachers before the commons were Marshall and Cornelius Burgess, names well known in sectarian annals. Their sermons were long, but delivered with great caution, and the house recompensed their labours by a present of plate. On the Sunday following the commons received the holy communion in the church of Saint Margaret, having previously desired that the communion table should be removed from the chancel into the body of the church. When this request was signified to Williams, he ungraciously replied, "I will certainly comply with the wishes of the house of commons, but I would do the same at the request of the meanest parishioner in my diocess."

Dec. 9.

At soon as the house of commons entered on the consideration of religious grievances, the acts and canons of the late convocation were brought under its review and animadversion. How far passion exceeded reasoning in that assembly must be seen by the following reflections from lord Digby: "Does not every parliament-man's heart rise to see the prelates usurping to themselves the grand pre-eminence of parliament? To see them granting subsidies under the name of a benevolence, under a no less penalty to them that

\* Moreton and Potter. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 7.

refuse it than the loss of heaven and earth—of heaven by excommunication, and of earth by deprivation; and this without redemption by appeal? A. D.  
1640.  
Charles I.

What good man can think with patience on such an ensnaring oath as that which the new canons enjoin to be taken by ministers, lawyers, physicians, and graduates, in the university, where, besides the swearing such an impertinence, as that things necessary to salvation are contained in discipline; besides the swearing those to be of divine right, which among the learned was never pretended to, as the arch things in our hierarchy; besides the swearing not to consent to the change of that which the state may, upon great reasons, think fit to alter; besides the bottomless perjury of an *et cætera*\*; besides all this, men must swear that they swear freely and voluntarily that which they are compelled to swear; and lastly, that they swear to the oath in the literal sense, whereof no two of the makers themselves, that I have heard of, could ever agree to the understanding."

One member† dared to raise his voice in defence of the convocation, but his arguments made no impression on the house; and at the close of the debate a committee was appointed to search and inspect the warrants by which the late convocation was held, after the dissolution of the parliament; to examine the letters patent of the convocation sub-

\* The oath was in substance, "I swear not to alter the government of the church by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, &c. as it now stands." The abbreviation implies *et cæteros*, not *et cætera*.

† Mr. Holbourn, who is said to have spoken for two hours.

CHAP. **XXV.** sidy; and to provide such other materials as might assist the house in forming its judgment.

Dec. 14.

On the day appointed for the discussion of this question, some of the more intemperate members would have aggravated the crime of the convocation into high treason; but they were convinced by Maynard and Bagshaw, two lawyers of their own party, that the offence could amount to nothing more than a "præmunire." At length the commons passed these unanimous resolutions; that the clergy of England, convened in any convocation or synod, have no power to make any constitutions, or canons, or acts whatsoever, in matters of doctrine or discipline, to bind the clergy or laity of the land, without the consent of parliament; that the several constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the late synods of Canterbury and York, were not binding on the clergy and laity of the land, or either of these estates; that they contained many matters contrary to the king's prerogative, the laws and statutes of the realm, the rights of parliament, and the property and liberty of the subject; and that the several grants of benevolence or contributions granted by the clergy of these provinces were contrary to the laws, and ought not to bind the clergy.

From these resolutions it appears, that the proceedings of the late convocation were censured on two grounds; on the enactment of canons, and on the grant of a subsidy, both being done without the consent of parliament. In the first case the commons were wrong, both in principle and precedent; in the second case, they were wrong as to pre-

cedent, but right as to principle. In the statute, confirming the submission of the clergy, passed in the reign of Henry the Eighth, it was enacted that the clergy should not make, promulge, or put in use any canons or constitutions without the royal assent; but the consent of parliament was not necessary. Every precedent was in favour of the exercise of this right by the convocation, independently of parliament, with the consent of the crown; and by the crown, independently both of parliament and convocation. Injunctions possessing a canonical force had been constantly issued solely by the authority of the sovereign; and, when they related to spiritual matters, without any infringement on the liberties of the subject. With respect to the right of convocation to grant a subsidy, it should be observed that, until the reign of Henry the Eighth\*, the subsidies of the clergy were made without any parliamentary confirmation. Since that time, the custom was observed, with one exception—the subsidy granted to Elizabeth on the invasion of the Spanish armada. But that single exception, in a custom of so late a date, was sufficient to justify a departure from it, on the ground of precedent. The origin of the parliamentary confirmation of the subsidies of convocation might be more effectually to secure their payment. The convocation could enforce it only by spiritual penalties, and therefore, that the crown might effectually recover the subsidies of the convocation, they were confirmed by an act of parliament. Yet, whatever might be the origin of this custom, it was in itself

A. D.  
1640.  
Charles I.

\* 37 Henry VIII.

CHAP. just and reasonable. If the clergy possessed an in-  
 XXV. dependent power of taxing themselves, they might,  
 by uniting with the crown, subvert the laws and  
 liberties of their country.

The application of the subsidy to promote a war in defence of episcopacy\* gave occasion to these doubts concerning its legality, and to the cavils against the canons. The whole of the odium and criminality was, therefore, however unjustly, borne by the clergy. The convocation was continued by a special commission from the king, without the advice of the archbishop; and the canons were confirmed by the privy council, in which he had only a single voice. The judges of England, in the presence of the council, asserted an independent power in the convocation to perform synodical acts. After the canons were completed, sir Henry Martin, with his utmost skill, urged before the council every objective argument which could be brought against them; and, after hearing his arguments, the canons were confirmed under the great seal, by the unanimous advice of the privy council. So that, if they were illegal or oppressive, the guilt of advising their confirmation, without which they must have been harmless, rests solely on the law authorities and the king's privy counsellors.

From a censure of the canons, the house, by an easy transition, carried its animadversions to their author, and on the same day several vehement speeches were directed against the archbishop of Canterbury. A committee was appointed to consider how far the primate had been concerned in

\* It was styled by the puritans " *Bellum episcopale*."

the late proceedings of the convocation, and in a treasonable design of subverting the religion of his country. On the next day, the earl of Bristol acquainted the house of lords that the Scottish commissioners had presented some articles against the archbishop, which, having been read, were reported to the house of commons, in a conference between the two houses. The articles consisted of various grievances, of all which the archbishop was accused of being the author; and the commissioners prayed that so great a delinquent\* might be removed from the presence and councils of the king, might be brought to a trial, and might receive such a punishment as, by the laws of the kingdom, he deserved.

A. D.  
1640.  
Charles I.

When the report of these articles was made in the house of commons, its resentment, which had been with difficulty smothered, vented itself in the most contumelious language, and in the most exaggerated statements. Sir Harbottle Grimstone said, that the archbishop of Canterbury was the author of all the calamities under which the nation groaned; that he had contrived all the mischievous projects in the revenue, by which many families had been utterly ruined; and that he had been charged on very strong evidence with a design of subverting the government and the protestant religion. "There is scarcely a grievance or a complaint laid before the house," observed this speaker, "wherein he is not mentioned, like an angry wasp, leaving his sting in every thing." He therefore moved, that the articles of the Scottish commis-

\* In the language of the Scots, "this great firebrand."

**CHAP. XXV.** sioners might be supported by an impeachment of an English house of commons. This motion being carried, the impeachment was sent up to the lords, with a request that the person of the archbishop might be in safe custody till the commons had made good their charge.

**Dec. 15.**

The archbishop having heard the impeachment, and being commanded to withdraw, stood up in his place and said, " I humbly desire your lordships to look upon the whole course of my life, which has been such as, I am persuaded, that not one man in the house of commons can believe me, in his heart, to be a traitor." The earl of Essex replied, that it was a severe reflection on the whole house of commons to suppose that they would charge him with a crime of which they did not believe him guilty. The archbishop then withdrew, and having been again called in, was committed to the custody of the usher of the black rod, until the commons had prepared their charges.

**Oct. 31.**

The impeachment of Laud was accompanied by accusations against those prelates who were supposed to entertain similar opinions. Neile, archbishop of York, who had been invariably joined with Laud as an Arminian and a papist, fortunately for his own safety, had died three days before the meeting of the parliament. Wren, bishop of Ely, remarkable for his strictness of discipline while bishop of Norwich, had a petition presented against him in the house of commons by the inhabitants of Ipswich: the committee for religious grievances also exhibited articles against him in the house of lords; and though he was not immediately

**Dec. 22.**

deprived of his liberty, he was obliged to enter into



recognizances for his future appearance. Com-  
 plaints were exhibited against Pierce, bishop of  
 Bath and Wells; Montague, of Norwich; Owen,  
 of Llandaff; and Mainwaring, of Saint David's;  
 but the house was too busily occupied to engage  
 in their prosecution.

A. D.  
 1640.  
 Charles I.

Of the personal friends of Laud, and the fa-  
 vourers of his principles, Juxon, bishop of London,  
 alone escaped, not only the attacks of faction, but  
 the strife of evil tongues. Originally promoted  
 by the recommendation of the primate, and, like  
 his patron, drawn from academical retirement into  
 active life; advanced to the important see of Lon-  
 don, and the invidious post of lord-treasurer; the  
 amiable qualities of Juxon disarmed hostility. More  
 than this, the mildness of his temper, and his  
 Christian courtesy, gained universal esteem; and  
 even the haters of prelacy could not hate bishop  
 Juxon\*. Seeing the gathering storm, he resigned  
 the treasurership, devoted himself to his spiritual  
 function as long as he was permitted to exercise  
 it, and then withdrew into private life.

The commons appear to have been so deeply  
 engaged with other grievances, that the articles of  
 impeachment against Laud were not prepared till  
 after the expiration of two months. By an order  
 of the house, three of their members, Pym, Hamp-  
 den, and Maynard, presented at the bar of the  
 house of lords fourteen articles in maintenance of  
 their charge of high treason, reserving to them-  
 selves a liberty of presenting some additional arti-

\* Granger's Biographical History, vol. ii.

CHAP.  
XXV.

cles to render the charge more definite and certain. The articles being read in the presence of the archbishop, by the favour of the house, he was permitted to make a brief reply to each article. He acknowledged that the charge was indeed heavy, and that if it were substantiated, he was unworthy to live; as yet, however, it consisted in generals, and general accusations made a great noise, but were no proof. From human frailties he was not free; but as to the least degree of corruption, he feared no accuser who would speak truth. The article which affected him with the most poignant grief was that of being false to his religion, as if his professions were with the church of England, while his heart was at Rome. He enlarged on all the articles separately, and ended by giving to the whole an absolute denial.

March 1.

It was then voted by the lords that the archbishop should be sent to the Tower, and he was conveyed thither through the city. As he was passing through Newgate-street, he was recognized by an apprentice, who incited the populace to follow him with insults and revilings, till he reached the Tower-gate.

Jan. 23.

After having sequestered or imprisoned those prelates who enforced the discipline of the church, the commons proceeded to attack that discipline in its several parts. A vote, or a resolution of the house, it was soon found had no legal force, and, therefore, by their sole authority, they appointed commissioners to demolish and remove out of all churches images, altars, or tables placed altarwise, crucifixes, pictures, and every monument or relic

of idolatry. This order, which was made on such questionable authority, the populace anticipated, without any authority at all.

A. D.  
1641.

---

Charles I.

The use of the liturgy began to be reprobated by all who professed an uncommon degree of spiritual purity. To read a prescribed form of prayer was called lip-worship, and a quenching of the holy Spirit, whose assistance is promised, not only to the matter but the manner of our prayers. It was now that Hall appeared in defence of the English liturgy, and in vindication of prescribed forms of prayer. His former treatise on episcopacy he wrote under the correction of another's judgment; but his present tract\* was written from the fulness of his own heart. His encomia on the English liturgy are more valuable, because given by one who allowed and practised voluntary and unpremeditated prayer. "Nothing," he observed, "hinders, but that this liberty and a public liturgy should be good friends, and go hand in hand together."

But the cause of the hierarchy was not to be decided by fair controversy; it was to be determined by judges whose partialities and antipathies were invincible by reason. Scarcely a month had elapsed from the opening of parliament, before a petition was presented by Pennington, an alderman of London, praying that episcopal government might be abolished, with all its dependencies, roots, and branches. It was said to be subscribed

\* An answer to Smectymnus, a fictitious name, composed of the initials of a junto of sectarians, viz. Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow.

CHAP.  
XXV.

---

by fifteen thousand names, but most of the subscribers consisted of the dregs of the people: the mode in which it was presented corresponded with the condition of the subscribers, for Pennington was attended by a mob, which surrounded the house.

The petition was combated by one from the friends of episcopacy, consisting, as the petitioners stated, of "the better sort of the inhabitants of the city, asserting the antiquity of the episcopal order, and its divine institution. "Episcopacy," in the language of the petition, "is as ancient as Christianity itself." If it were unlawful, it would have not obtained that universality which cannot be denied to it. For fifteen hundred years it had subsisted, and if it had been unlawful, would not its unlawfulness have been sooner discovered than in the present age? It is a form of government not only lawful, but conducive to edification, because no man can deny that the primitive times were most famous for piety, constancy, and perseverance in the faith. The government of the church by bishops is most suitable to the frame of the civil government of England, a fact evident from "the happy and flourishing union of both, for so long a period." If episcopacy were abolished, its opponents have not agreed on any other form to succeed it, as appears from the various and contrary schemes which they have published.

A third petition, recommending a middle course, was presented by ten or twelve clergymen, in the name of seven hundred of their brethren, and which was hence called the ministers' petition. It prayed for a reformation of certain grievances in

Jan. 23.

the hierarchy, but not for the subversion of episcopacy. The grievances consisted in the secular employments of the clergy, in the arbitrary power of bishops, and in the large revenues of deans and chapters.

A.D.  
1641.

Charles I.

Two days after the presentation of this petition, the king came to the house, and delivered his opinion on the late proceedings of the parliament. His speech was to the following effect : " There are some men who, more maliciously than ignorantly, will not distinguish between reformation and alteration of government; hence it comes to pass that divine service is indecently interrupted, and petitions presented against the established form of church government. Now, though I am for the first, yet I cannot give way to the latter. If some of the bishops have overstretched their power, and encroached too much on the temporality, I shall not be unwilling that these abuses shall be corrected; nay, farther, if you can show me that the bishops possess any authority inconvenient to the state, I shall not be unwilling to desire them to lay it down; but this must not be understood as a consent to take away their votes in parliament, for in all the times of my predecessors, since and before the conquest, they have enjoyed this right, as one of the fundamental constitutions of the kingdom."

Several days were appointed for the consideration of the petitions, and called forth characteristic speeches. Sir Henry Vane argued for the total extirpation of episcopacy, since it was introduced by antichrist. It had divided the church of England from the foreign protestant churches, and the protestant religion must be always in danger while

CHAP.  
XXV.

---

it remained in such corrupt hands. These arguments were supported by serjeant Thomas and Bradshaw, and by White, who considered the bishops of the church, with regard to their baronies, their temporalities, and spiritualities. But the lords Falkland and Digby, while they fully admitted the corruptions of the hierarchy, and the intemperate conduct of some individual prelates, vehemently opposed the abolition of the episcopal order. The last speaker thus adverted to the origin of the petitions: "I look upon the petitions with terror, as on a comet, or a blazing star, raised and kindled out of the poisonous exhalations of a corrupted hierarchy: methought the comet had a terrible tail, and it pointed to the north, and I fear all the prudence of the house will scarcely hinder this meteor from causing such combustions as it portends by its appearance \*."

After a full consideration of the petitions, the greatest favour which could be obtained from that of Pennington was, that it should not be rejected,

\* It was in one of these debates that Selden uttered his well-known repartee. Sir Harbottle Grimstone argued in the following manner: "That bishops are *jure divino* is a question; that archbishops are not *jure divino* is out of the question: now that bishops which are questioned, whether *jure divino*, or archbishops, which unquestionably are not *jure divino*, should suspend ministers which are *jure divino*, I leave to be considered." The argument was answered by Selden thus: "That the convocation is *jure divino* is a question; that parliament is not *jure divino* is out of the question; that religion is *jure divino* is no question: now that the convocation, which is questionable whether *jure divino*, and that parliament, which is unquestionably not *jure divino*, should meddle with religion, which questionless is *jure divino*, I leave to your consideration."

solely on account of the number of the petitioners. It was suffered to remain in the hands of the clerk of the house, with a direction that no copy of it should be given. The ministers' petition was referred to a committee of the whole house, and a bill was in consequence brought in; that no bishop should have any vote in parliament, any judicial power in the star chamber, or any authority in temporal affairs, and that no clergyman should be in the commission of the peace.

A. D.  
1641.  
Charles I.

Since the imprisonment of Laud, the chief direction of ecclesiastical affairs had devolved on Williams; and if the church could have been saved by an entire change in its administration, he was the most eligible person to be intrusted with its government. His long retirement from public life, and his subsequent persecution, had not extinguished his love of intrigue, and his ambitious designs. He had not only ingratiated himself with the house of commons, but even with the king. By his advice a committee for religion was appointed in the upper house, consisting of ten earls, ten bishops, and ten barons; and this committee was afterwards invested with the power of calling other divines to its assistance for the reformation of ecclesiastical abuses, both in doctrine and discipline.

March 15.

Perceiving that the first step towards the overthrow of the hierarchy was the contemplated removal of the bishops from the house of lords, the great aim of Williams was to preserve their seats. But he had not the courage, or rather the virtue, to maintain this privilege in its integrity; for, by a voluntary dereliction of a part, he vainly thought

CHAP.  
XXV.

---

to preserve the remainder. The commons began their attack on this ancient right of the episcopal order, on the trial of the earl of Strafford. After many bitter invectives against the order in general, and against individual prelates, they took the case to be clear, on the authority of an old canon, the only one which they allowed to be orthodox \*, that a cleric ought not to be present in cases of blood. It was therefore resolved, that the right of bishops to sit on a case touching life should be referred to the consideration of a committee of the house of peers. This resolution was not made without concert, and without a previous communication with Williams. As soon as the question was agitated in the house of lords, he stood up, and moved, in behalf of himself and his brethren, that they might be excused from attendance on the approaching trial. His arguments in favour of this exemption were in themselves of no weight, especially when compared with his conduct after the bill of attainder had been carried through the two houses. Though he asserted it to be derogatory from the episcopal order to be present in cases of blood, yet his secret advice to his sovereign proved that he was not actuated by any uncommon feelings of humanity to give up his parliamentary privilege, which was in reality to desert his duty. In the long and severe conflict which Charles sustained, interest, honour, and friendship, obliged him to protect Strafford. All these motives he felt and urged, and when they were urged in vain, religion was his last plea. But to overcome this strongest

\* Clarendon.



obligation, and to lull his conscientious feelings, Williams was at hand\*. This prelate told the king that there was a private and a public conscience; that public conscience as a king might not only excuse, but compel the performance of an act against private conscience as a man. The question was not, whether the earl of Strafford should be saved, but whether the king ought to perish with him? The conscience of a king to preserve his kingdom, the conscience of a husband to preserve his wife, the conscience of a father to preserve his children, all of which were in danger, weighed down abundantly all the considerations which the conscience of a master or a friend could suggest for the preservation of a servant or a friend†. Such wretched sophistry, which shame would have prevented Williams from avowing in the house of lords as a judge, he hesitated not to insinuate in the royal closet as a casuist.

A. D.  
1641.  
Charles I.

The base compliance of Williams on this occasion to the wishes of the house of commons was requited as it deserved. It delayed not the introduction or the progress of two bills, one for the abolition of all cathedral and collegiate corporations, and the other for taking away the temporal

\* The king consulted several bishops, as Usher, Hall, and Juxon. Juxon courageously advised the king, if in his conscience he did not approve the bill, to refuse his assent. Clarendon's History, vol. i.

† Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. b. 3. There is no doubt that this fact was communicated to Clarendon by the king himself. See Warburton's Remarks. It receives confirmation from Parr's Life of Archbishop Usher; and it is far more credible than the representation given by Hacket of the transaction, in his Life of Williams.

CHAP.  
XXV.

privileges of the bishops. As the capitular and collegiate bodies were attacked separately from the bishops, a different mode of defence was adopted. These establishments deputed one out of their number to solicit their friends in the house of commons in their behalf, and the house was also petitioned to allow the chapters to be heard by counsel. The petition to be heard by counsel was rejected; but two of their body were allowed to speak at the bar of the house in favour of these ecclesiastical corporations. Several members argued, that no man ought to be deprived of his freehold without being first heard. Two eminent divines were therefore selected to plead the cause of deans and chapters, and the choice fell on Bargrave, dean of Canterbury, and Hacket, archdeacon of Bedford. The speech of Bargrave has not been preserved; but that of Hacket merits a recapitulation of its arguments\*.

May 12.

Cathedrals, he maintained, were of use to supply the defects of private prayer, the public performance of which should be in some place of distinction. But since the refinement of the music gave offence to some ears, as hindering devotion, he requested, in the name of his brethren, that it might be moderated to edification, and reduced to the form recommended by Athanasius†. A common prejudice existed, that cathedrals were unfriendly to preaching; but in answer he observed, that the local statutes of all these establishments required lectures, even on week days; and he also requested,

\* It is preserved in Plume's *Life of Hacket*, prefixed to his *Centenary of Sermons*.

† *Ut legentibus sint quam cantantibus similiores.*

in the name of his brethren, that the godly and profitable exercise of preaching might be enforced. Cathedral and collegiate establishments were serviceable to the promotion of learning, and learning as well as religion would suffer by their subversion. To those who thought that episcopacy ought to be reduced to a superintendence or presidency over a certain number of presbyters, he forcibly urged that deans and chapters were the spiritual council of bishops, and therefore their continuance was essentially connected with a moderated episcopacy. It was also proper to consider the antiquity and beauty of the structures set apart for cathedral worship, and the number of persons maintained in them. With respect to the tenants of church lands, they enjoyed by their leases six parts in seven of the annual profits, and these tenants had united in petitioning that such beneficial tenures might not be abolished. He also reminded the house, that the cities in which cathedrals were built had been enriched, both by the liberality of the clergy, and by the resort of strangers. He enlarged farther on the utility of these endowments as encouragements to industry and virtue : he mentioned the names of many illustrious foreigners, who had received benefit from these institutions, as Casaubon, Seravia, Peter du Moulin, and Vossius, had all been members of these foundations. It might be added, that the crown derived a great benefit from cathedrals, as the members paid into the exchequer for first fruits and tenths a proportionably larger sum than any other ecclesiastical preferments. It was also an argument, which ought not to be omitted in a Christian assembly,

A. D.  
1641.

Charles I.

CHAP.  
XXV.

that these structures and estates were consecrated to the glory of God, and to piety and charity; they could not, therefore, be alienated without provoking the divine anger. Addressing himself to the speaker, he concluded his animated harangue in these words: "I have now done, if you will let me add this epiphonema. Upon the ruins of the rewards of learning no structure can be raised but ignorance, and upon the chaos of ignorance no structure can be raised but profaneness and confusion." So great was the impression produced by this speech that it is supposed, if the question had been then called for, it would have been carried in favour of the cathedrals by a considerable majority.

The bill for taking away the votes of the bishops in parliament was framed after a long deliberation and with great art. To induce the consent of the friends of episcopacy, a private assurance was given that, if the measure were carried, no farther measure should be taken in prejudice of the church. Many persons were persuaded that an assent to the bill was to give an effectual support to the ecclesiastical constitution, and thus it found an easy passage through the house of commons. In the house of lords it was supported by the earl of Essex and lord Kimbolton. It has been said that Kimbolton privately urged the bishops voluntarily to resign their seats in parliament, adding that the temporal lords would then be bound in honour to preserve the episcopal jurisdiction and revenues\*. Yet notwithstanding the countenance given to the

\* Fuller's Church History, b. 11.

bill by these two peers, it experienced so vigorous an opposition that it was thrown out on the second reading, without being committed; and even if the bishops had not voted for the preservation of their own seats, it would have been lost by a very large majority. Williams was the leading prelate who spoke against the bill, and among the temporal lords the marquess of Hereford, the earls of Southampton, Bath, and Bristol, and above all viscount Newark, distinguished themselves. They argued that if the commons assumed a right of removing the bench of bishops from their house to-day, the barons or any other degree of nobility might be removed to-morrow; till at length the whole house of peers might be voted mischievous and useless\*.

A. D.  
1641.  
Charles I.

May 21  
and 24.

It may be thought surprising that the king, in this crisis, did not interpose his prerogative, and prevent any farther infringements on the constitution by a dissolution of the parliament. If he had adopted this decisive measure, and placed himself at the head of his army, he might, in all probability, have saved his country from the calamity of a civil war. But it was the fault of Charles never to make a stand at the point when resistance could be effectual. On the contrary, he now gave up his vantage ground, and yielded to his enemies the disposal of his future condition. At the same time, when he signed the commission of attainder against the earl of Strafford he gave his assent to a bill, enacting that the present parliament should not be adjourned, prorogued, or dis-

\* Nalson's Collect. vol. i.

**CHAP.** solved, without their own consent\*. A bill which  
**XXV.** removed one of the great landmarks of the constitution did not pass the house of lords without a spirited resistance; but it was assented to by the king without a struggle, and almost without a comment. Thus when he signed the death warrant of Strafford he signed his own, and destroyed the monarchy by his suicidal act.

Though Charles possessed not the magnanimity to dissolve his parliament, and openly to place himself at the head of the army, yet he cannot be satisfactorily exculpated from a design of bringing his army to overawe the deliberations of parliament†. The discovery of this design gave occasion or a pretext for the famous PROTESTATION. It contained a promise to maintain and defend the true reformed protestant religion, expressed in the doctrine of the church of England, against all popery and popish innovations; to protect the person, honour, and estate of the king, and the lawful rights and liberties of the subject.

The engagement was taken without hesitation by the speaker of the house of commons, and by all the members then present. It was then sent up to the house of lords, and all the members, the bishops not excepted, scrupled not to take it, with the exception of the earl of Southampton and lord Roberts. Those peers, whose loyalty was unimpeached, positively refused, alleging that there was no law requiring such an act, and that the consequences of such voluntary engagements might

\* Stat. 16 Car. I. c. 7. See Hume's History of England, c. 54, and note B. B. end of vol. vi.

† Clarendon's History, and bishop Warburton's Remarks.

be such as were not intended by those who fettered themselves by unnecessary vows.

A. D.  
1641.

---

Charles I.

The event proved that these noblemen judged rightly; for the protestation carried with it all the artifice of the Scottish covenant. The royalists and episcopalians thought that the protestation was an engagement to defend the existing constitution in church and state, but the enemies of royalty and episcopacy added a gloss by which they interpreted the engagement in favour of their own schemes. Two days after the protestation was taken, some of the popular party informed the house of commons that many pious persons, and persons well affected to the parliament, apprehended that they had incautiously engaged to defend the order of bishops. This was never intended: it was necessary therefore to add an explanation, that the protestation applied only to popery, and was not to be extended to maintain the worship and discipline of the English church.

May 5.

This explanation having been published by the authority of the house of commons, in contradiction to the intention of many who took the protestation, that house next ordered that both documents should be published. They were then sent to the sheriffs and magistrates of the different counties, with a direction that they should be taken by the whole nation, and that the names of all recusants should be inserted in a register.

Such an arbitrary assumption of legislative power was treated with neglect or contempt by the nation at large, on which the house of commons passed a bill compelling all the king's subjects to take the protestation. This bill, when sent up to the house

CHAP.  
XXV.

---

of lords, was received with indignation, and rejected instantly, and almost unanimously. But the commons, with many expressions of rage, declared, by a vote, that the protestation was fit to be taken by all persons well affected to religion and the good of the commonwealth, and that whoever refused it was unfit to bear office in church or state. It was farther voted that this resolution should be printed, and sent by the knights and burgesses to their respective counties. This unparalleled breach of privilege was resented by many of the lords, on behalf of their own privileges, and the liberties of the subject; but the king was unfortunately persuaded to interpose his mediation, and the disgraceful violation of the constitution was passed over, though not forgotten.

The conduct of the bishops in this transaction proved them to be worthy of the place which they held in the hereditary council of the nation, but their firmness invited a renewed attack by the lower house. The rejection of the protestation was imputed chiefly to the bishops, and it induced the introduction of a bill for the utter extirpation of episcopacy. The bill was framed by Saint John, the solicitor general, and was presented to the speaker by sir Edward Deering. The mover made a short speech, in which he noticed the moderation of the commons in the late bill for removing the bishops from the house of lords, hoping that, by pruning and cutting off a few unnecessary branches, the tree might flourish better; but since this gentle method had failed, it was necessary to lay "the axe to the root of the tree." "I never was for ruin," he said, "as long as there was any hopes of



reforming, and I now profess that if those hopes  
revive and prosper, I will divide my sense upon  
this bill, and yield my shoulders to underprop the  
primitive, just, and lawful episcopacy\*.”

A. D.  
1641.  
Charles I.

The bill was strongly opposed, as being contrary to the usage of parliament, having been brought in without leave. It was with difficulty obtained that it should be read a first time, and its second reading was deferred for two months. It was then read a second time, and committed by a majority of twenty-one. Hyde, afterwards earl of Clarendon, was appointed chairman of the committee, that he might not obstruct the bill by his eloquence and argument; but in his situation as chairman he was enabled to impede its course, and the committee, after twenty days, had made so little progress, that the bill was laid aside till the commencement of the civil war.

Finding that no alteration could be effected in the church or state while the bench of bishops remained in the house of lords, and unable to carry a bill of exclusion, the commons devised several projects to divide the spiritual lords and the temporal. At last it was proposed to amerce the two houses of convocation for compiling and publishing the late canons; but after deliberation, it was thought preferable to punish the bishops only for their concern in this affair. Agreeably to this resolution, a committee was appointed to frame an

July 31.

\* Clarendon represents sir Edward Deering as a man of levity and vanity, and that his great motive in delivering this speech was to introduce the following quotation from Ovid:

*Cuncta prius tentanda, sed immedicabile vulnus  
Ense recidendum est, ne pars sincera trahatur.*

CHAP.  
XXV.

impeachment against all the bishops who had been present at the convocation \*. They were impeached of high crimes and misdemeanours; first, for enacting and publishing canons and constitutions contrary to the king's prerogative, to the fundamental laws of the realm, to the rights of parliament, and to the liberties of the subject; and secondly, for granting a benevolence or contribution to be paid by the clergy, contrary to law.

The impeachment was carried up to the lords by serjeant Wild, who demanded, in the name of the commons, that the bishops might be forthwith obliged to answer the crimes and misdemeanours alleged against them; and that such farther proceedings might be instituted as to law and justice appertained. It was expected that the bishops would have relinquished their seats in parliament to be discharged of this impeachment, but they resolved not to be driven from their post. They only desired time to prepare their answer, and counsel for their assistance†. After some opposition, they were allowed three months to put in their answer, and counsel of their own nomination‡.

During this period the two armies had remained in their respective stations, maintained at an enormous charge, and it was industriously re-

\* Amounting to thirteen.

† Rushworth's Collect. vol. iii.

‡ The bishops made choice of Warner, bishop of Rochester, to manage their cause, and this prelate retained Chute and Jermin as their council. Jermin refused to plead without a licence from the house of commons, and was therefore laid by; but Chute being asked by the temporal lords, whether he would plead for the bishops, replied, "Yes, as long as I have a tongue to plead with." Fuller's Church History, b. 11.

ported that the Scots would not leave England till the bill was passed for the extirpation of episcopacy. The king endeavoured to expedite the pacification, when, by mutual agreement, both armies were to be disbanded; but the commons were inclined to procrastinate the negotiation. After doubts and misgivings on both sides, the pacification was concluded, and was ratified by the king only the day before he began his long meditated journey into Scotland. One article of the pacification was a resolution of uniformity as to church government in both kingdoms, and such an uniformity the king desired not less than the Scots. But Charles sought to bring his Scottish subjects to the English model, whereas the Scots intended to bring the church of England to a conformity with their own presbyterian kirk. The king, by yielding compliance to this article, couched in general terms, thought to break the confederacy between the factions of both nations; but the English parliament penetrated into his motive. One lord and three commoners\* were appointed to attend, or rather to follow the king into Scotland, in order to maintain a good correspondence with the Scottish parliament, and to exhort the Scottish nation never to desert their English friends till both countries had secured their liberties.

A. D.  
1641.  
Charles I.

Before the king's departure, he had given his assent to some laws of high importance and of beneficial tendency. The frequency of parliaments was secured by a bill for their triennial

\* Lord Howard of Esric, Mr. Fiennes, Mr. Hambden, and sir William Comyn.

CHAP. meeting; the courts of high commission\* and of  
 XXV. the star chamber† were abolished. By the act which abolished the star chamber, the power of the privy council was regulated, and it was declared that neither the king nor his privy council had any jurisdiction over the property of any English subject. Satisfied, at present, with these concessions, the commons, having first appointed a committee to sit during the recess for the despatch of any important business, adjourned for two months; a period which, they assumed, would comprehend that of the king's absence.

Immediately after the king's arrival at Edinburgh, the Scottish parliament met, and the king, in a most gracious manner, acquainted the estates that the end of his coming into his native country was to quiet its distractions. The first object of his solicitude was the settlement of religious disputes, and the security of civil liberty. He therefore confirmed, in the most ample manner, all the late acts of episcopacy, and the erection of the tables in defence of their liberties; the acts of the general assembly at Glasgow were declared valid, in which the government of the church by archbishops and bishops was pronounced to be contrary to the word of God, and was therefore abolished. Alexander Henderson waited on the king, as his chaplain, and provided preachers for the royal chapel. The professors of the universities received an augmentation of their stipends from the revenues of the dissolved bishoprics. Titles of honour were conferred on many of their gentry, and when

\* Stat. 16 Car. I. c. 11.

† Stat. 16 Car. I. c. 10.

the king left Scotland, it was said that he departed a contented king from a contented people.

A. D.  
1641.

---

Charles I.

Different, however, was the condition of England during the absence of the king. The house of commons, through its committee, which sate during the recess, prosecuted its design of altering the worship and ceremonial of the English church. It has been observed, that the house, of its own authority, had sent commissioners into the different counties, for removing all the monuments of superstition from churches. Following this ordinance, it was farther resolved, that the churchwardens of the several parishes should forthwith remove the communion-table from the eastern end of the churches, when they stand altarwise, and take away the rails; that all corporal reverence to the altar, and that the practice of bowing at the name of Jesus, should be discontinued. The lords not assenting to these resolutions, the commons published a declaration, enjoining obedience to the ordinance, and arraigning the conduct of the peers.

While this diversity of opinion between the two houses neutralized the legislature, the religious state of the country was deplorable. The temples of God were profaned, the ornaments and utensils of divine worship abused, the liturgy depraved and neglected, the Lord's prayer itself vilified, the sacraments of the gospel in some places rudely administered, in other places omitted, marriages illegally solemnized, burials uncharitably performed, and the very fundamentals of religion subverted by the publication of a new creed, teaching the abrogation of the moral law \*. A severe struggle was main-

\* Petition from the city of Canterbury.

**CHAP.** tained between the bishops and the house of com-  
**XXV.** mons for the occupancy of the pulpits. Notwith-  
standing the votes of the committee, the bishops  
inhibited preaching in the afternoon of Sundays,  
although the committee had resolved that every  
minister might preach in his church as often as he  
pleased.

To alienate the affections of the people from the king, such lecturers were placed in the most populous parishes as regarded the existing government in church and state with abhorrence; and from the beginning of the parliament, not one orthodox or learned man was \* recommended by the commons to any church in England. The king himself, in one of his declarations, asserted the fact. "Under pretence of encouraging preaching, they have erected lectures in several parishes, and recommended such lecturers as were men of no learning or conscience, but furious promoters of the most dangerous innovations; many having taken no orders, were yet recommended by the house to parishes; and when mechanics have been brought before them for preaching in churches, and confessed the same, have been dismissed without punishment, and hardly without reprehension."

Williams now saw, though too late, that his enmity to Laud had betrayed him into a desertion of the rights of the church, and, which was worse, of his own integrity. Fruitlessly he now exerted himself to repress the mischief which he had himself contributed to spread. He visited his diocess

\* Clarendon. "Incredible as this may appear, it may be seen, from the lists of those lecturers, to be very true." Bishop Warburton.

during the adjournment of parliament, and exhorted the people not to desert their lawful pastors, nor to forsake the worship of the church. "Look back," said the bishop, "to the beginning of the reign of queen Elizabeth. Can the church stand better against the church of Rome than it has done under the bishops, liturgy, and canons? Therefore, do not abandon the good old way for another, of which you do not know how much evil may be in it." The rhetoric of Williams had little effect in allaying the inflamed passions of the people of his diocese, but it exasperated the house of commons against himself. He was now more hated than any other prelate; and having, on a day of public thanksgiving for the pacification between the two nations, composed a form of prayer for the occasion, the house of commons animadverted with great severity on his presumption, and prohibited the form from being read.

A. D.  
1641.

Charles I.

Sept. 7.

Before the king left Scotland, he received intelligence of that dreadful event, the Irish massacre. An impartial judgment of the causes of this horrid catastrophe cannot, without difficulty, be formed; for a fair statement of its circumstances cannot be obtained. When the intelligence was communicated in England, it spread a general consternation; and the house of commons, really fearing, or pretending to fear, for its own safety, ordered a guard of the trained bands, and deliberated how the English nation might be secured against the machinations of the papists. No event could have been more fatal to the royal cause. The queen was publicly accused of being the author of the rebellion, and the king was unjustly charged with

November.

**CHAP.** wilful ignorance of its progress, and culpable negli-  
**XXV.** gence in its suppression.

---

- Dec. 1.** The Irish massacre furnished the disaffected with a pretext for new encroachments on the regal power, and the house of commons with a plausible reason for presenting to the king a REMONSTRANCE on the state of the nation. After having been presented to the king, it was printed and circulated, before his answer could be obtained. Such unfair and contemptuous treatment he properly resented, and expressed his disapprobation of the substance of the remonstrance, in firm but temperate language. With not less reason he thought that an answer delivered to the house of commons was insufficient; and, in imitation of their example, circulated throughout the kingdom a declaration of his late motives and conduct. He expressed his conviction that the church of England was most agreeable to the word of God; and this belief he should be ready to seal with his blood, if God should call on him to suffer in its behalf. As to ceremonies, he was willing to grant an exemption to tender consciences, provided the peace of the kingdom was not disturbed, nor the decency of divine service discountenanced, nor the pious, sober, and devout actions of those reverend persons, who were the first labourers in the blessed reformation, scandalized and defamed.
- Dec. 12.**

While the king was in Scotland, it was industriously reported that, having yielded to the demands of the Scots, he intended to abolish episcopacy in England on his return. An institution which, by the law of Scotland, was declared to be unscriptural, could not, in England, be agreeable



to the word of God. To silence these reports, the king officially signified his intention \* to preserve the doctrine and discipline of the English church, as it was established by queen Elizabeth and his father. As a proof that his declaration was sincere, he resolved to fill the vacant sees; but the two houses joined in a petition that the affair might be suspended till his return.

A. D.  
1641.

Charles I.

Soon after he arrived in England, he executed his intention, notwithstanding the dissatisfaction and remonstrances of the commons. Williams was raised to the archbishoprick of York; and Winniffe, dean of Saint Paul's, a grave and moderate divine, was appointed bishop of Lincoln, in his room. Hall was translated to Norwich; and Brownrigg, a divine of the same principles with Winniffe, was placed in the vacant see of Exeter. As a support to the falling church, the prelacy had an accession of strength in Usher and Prideaux. At the opening of the parliament, Usher had sought a refuge in England, and had been the confidential adviser of the king in ecclesiastical affairs. In doctrinal Calvinism he was not exceeded by the most violent of the puritans; in his support of episcopacy he was as moderate as was consistent with communion in the English church. His tracts in support of the episcopal order, since his residence in England, had rendered an essential service, and he was distinguished, rather than rewarded, by the commendatory possession of the see of Carlisle, in conjunction with the Irish primacy. Prideaux had filled the theological chair at Oxford for twenty-seven

\* In a letter to Nichols, clerk of the council, dated Oct. 18, 1641. Nalson's Collect. vol. ii.

CHAP.  
XXV.

---

years, and was also rector of Exeter college in that university. His government of the college had rendered it the residence of the most learned foreigners, and the divinity school was never before filled with such a constant and numerous auditory. In him the genius of Jewel, Hooker, and Reynolds seemed to be united, "and to triumph anew." From those stations which he had so long adorned, he was removed, by the favour of the king, to the bishoprick of Worcester.

If these appointments depressed the enemies of episcopacy, they clung with fond expectation to the pending impeachment of thirteen bishops for the promulgation of the canons, and the grant of the subsidy. The lords had resolved, that the impeached bishops should not be present till the mode of proceeding was settled; but that they might then be present, though not permitted to vote. To enable them to provide for their defence, it was also resolved, that Warner, bishop of Rochester, with one of the other prelates, might have access to the archbishop of Canterbury in the Tower. The bishops, before the time allowed had elapsed, put in their answer to the impeachment, consisting of a plea and a demurrer, in which they neither confessed nor denied the fact, but pleaded that the offence of making canons could not amount to a "præmunire." The answer was signed by all the bishops, with the exception of Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, who pleaded, generally, "not guilty."

The commons were dissatisfied with the bishops, for not pleading directly to the charge; and with the house of lords, for admitting the demurrer in

the absence of the commons. They therefore prayed, that the lords would set aside the demurrer, and suffer them to prove their charge without delay; or, if the lords were already satisfied with the charge, and the bishops persisted in refusing to plead to it directly, that the house would proceed to judgment. The lords, instead of complying with this request, referred it to the bishops, whether they would plead directly to the impeachment, or abide by their demurrer. The bishops having chosen the latter alternative, a day was appointed for the commencement of the trial. But the commons, instead of substantiating their charge, alleged that it was useless to attempt it, since the partiality of the lords was apparent, and both the court and nobility were resolved to protect the bishops at all hazards, and in defiance of all justice.

A. D.  
1641.  
Charles I.

The issue of the impeachment inflamed the rage of the sectarians beyond all bounds. The aldermen and common council of London drew up a petition, and, attended by a vast multitude, presented it to the house of commons. The petition prayed, that the house would not remit its exertions, but would persuade the king and the lords to concur in redressing the grievances of the church and the state. Of all these grievances, none more imperiously demanded an immediate remedy than the privilege of the bishops to sit in parliament. The speaker, in the name of the house, returned thanks to the petitioners, and promised to take the petition into consideration. The apprentices of London presented a similar address, signed by a great number, complaining of the decay of trade; a calamity occasioned by papists, pre-

CHAP. lates, and malignants, and praying for the extir-  
XXV. pation of prelacy.

---

These petitions against episcopacy were opposed by counter-petitions, signed by persons of the greatest weight in the country for rank, wealth, and intelligence. But these it was not sufficient to neglect; they were visited by severe marks of displeasure. The injustice of such conduct was thus exposed by the king: "Have so many petitions, even against the form and constitution of the kingdom, and the laws established, been so joyfully received and accepted; and shall petitions framed on these grounds be called mutinous? hath a multitude of mean, unknown, inconsiderable, contemptible persons, about the city and suburbs of London, had the liberty to petition against the government of the church, the book of common prayer, and been thanked for it; and shall it be called mutinous in the gravest and best citizens of London, in the gentry and commonalty of Kent, to frame petitions on these grounds, and to desire to be governed by the known laws of the land, not by votes or orders of either or both the houses? To stir up men to a care of maintaining the discipline of the church, upholding and continuing the reverence and solemnity of God's service, is mutiny! Let heaven and earth, God and man, judge between us and these men!"

The petitions against episcopacy were generally succeeded by the most dangerous insurrections; and when they were presented, the houses of parliament were surrounded by crowds, shouting, "No bishops! no popish lords!" Skirmishes frequently ensued between the guards and the multitude, and

generally to the disadvantage of the undisciplined populace.

A. D.  
1641.

---

Charles I.

With a becoming spirit, the lords exerted themselves to repress these tumults. On one occasion, the crowd having pressed with violence against the doors of the house, the earl of Dorset called out the trained bands; but the commons countermanded the order, and the military force was withdrawn. The tumults only elicited this observation from Pym: "God forbid that the house of commons should proceed in any way to dishearten the people from obtaining their just desires!"

While the tumults were raging with the greatest fury, the bishops were advised to discontinue their parliamentary attendance; but, encouraged by the archbishop of York, they persevered in the performance of their duty. Since they were liable not only to insult, but to personal violence, they agreed to go down to the house in barges, to avoid passing the streets. But as soon as they approached the shore, they were saluted by a shower of stones, and other missiles, and compelled to return without gaining admission.

Thus repulsed, twelve of the bishops met privately at the house of the archbishop of York, to deliberate on their future course. Williams, who regarded no episcopal privilege and no episcopal duty so highly as that of a legislator, animated his brethren to adopt a measure at this crisis the most imprudent which could be devised. Instead of petitioning for a guard to protect the bishops in their passage to the house, he drew up a protestation, which was signed by every bishop present, except the bishop of Winchester. It protested

CHAP.  
XXV.

against the validity of all acts which might be passed during their compulsory absence. This protestation might be "good law and good logic;" but it was not good policy. It was previously shown to the king by Williams himself, who undertook to justify its legality; but the king declined to give an opinion on so delicate a subject, and delivered the document to the lord-keeper, Littleton, to be communicated to the house of lords. Littleton, "willing to ingratiate himself with the house of commons, and the faction to which he knew himself sufficiently obnoxious \*," read it openly in the house of lords, and having characterized it as containing matters of high and dangerous import, sent it down to the house of commons. After a short debate there, an impeachment against all the protesting bishops was brought up by serjeant Glynne, accusing them of high treason, and on the same evening the offending prelates were sequestered from parliament. Ten were immediately sent to the Tower, while the bishops of Durham and Lichfield, in consequence of the piety and learning of the one, and the age and infirmities of both, were committed to the custody of the usher of the black rod.

1642.  
Jan. 4.

If the rash conduct of these prelates accelerated the downfall of the order, the imprudent and illegal conduct of the king, a few days after their committal, deprived him of the power of arresting the ruin either of the church or monarchy. The tumults occasioned by his attempt to seize, within the walls of the house of commons, five obnoxious

\* Clarendon.

members, compelled him to leave his palace at Whitehall, and to retire, first to Hampton-court, and afterwards to Windsor.

A. D.  
1642.

Charles I.

On the day following the imprisonment of the prelates, the commons urged the lords to resume the consideration of a bill which had been laid aside, for taking away all temporal jurisdiction from the clergy. The impeachment of the bishops was committed to the "sharpest wits and greatest lawyers" of the party; but even their perspicacity could not see any treason in the protestation\*; "insomuch that one of their oracles, being demanded his judgment concerning the fact, professed to them, that they might with as good reason accuse the bishops of adultery†." But the sequestration of the protesting prelates from the house pending their impeachment, facilitated the bill for depriving the whole order of its parliamentary privileges. The impeachment was ultimately abandoned; for the imprisoned prelates, after a confinement of five months, were set at liberty on bail; but the bill for removing the bishops from the house of lords was immediately resumed. On a single prelate, not included in the protestation, Warner bishop of Rochester, devolved the honourable office of defending to the last, the rights of episcopacy. As long as he had a voice left, he raised it in pleading the antiquity and justice of the seats of bishops in parliament‡. The bill, however, passed by a large majority, and the citizens of London expressed their joy at the event by bells and bonfires§.

\* Bishop Hall's Hard Measure.

† Ibid.

‡ Fuller's Church Hist. b. 11.

§ Ibid.

CHAP.  
XXV.

Feb. 6.

Still the royal assent was to be obtained, and it was not obtained without difficulty. The commons sent a message to Windsor, pressing the compliance of the king, and intimating that his assent would be received as a pledge of his sincerity in wishing to redress the other grievances of the nation. The message from the commons was enforced by the confidential advisers of the crown, who argued, that the combination against the bishops was irresistible, and that to pass the bill was the only way to save the church. Yet these arguments would not have prevailed, if the queen had not exerted her despotic influence. She was herself persuaded by her favourites, that if she were the accredited adviser of the measure, and succeeded in its accomplishment, she would render herself acceptable to the house of commons and the whole nation. The firmness of Charles was

Feb. 14.

at last overcome, the royal assent\* was notified by commission while the king was at Canterbury, accompanying the queen on her journey to Holland. But the reluctance with which his assent was given rendered the boon unacceptable. This was one of the last bills to which he assented, and the only bill to which he assented in prejudice of the church. Here he determined to make a stand; and, in a message to the two houses, expressed his desire that he might not be urged to any further act, till the ecclesiastical government and the liturgy were so digested and settled, that he might see clearly what was fit to remain, and what to take away†.

\* St. 16 Car. I. c. 27.

† Rushworth's Collect.



## CHAPTER XXVI.

Preparations for Hostilities.—Parliament unites with the Scots.—Parliament passes a Bill for the Abolition of Episcopacy.—Commencement of Hostilities.—Oxford the Residence of the Court.—Treaty at Oxford.—Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction placed in the Hands of a Committee of the House of Commons.—Committees for scandalous Ministers and plundered Ministers.—Fifths allowed to the ejected Clergy.—Assembly of Divines.—Solemn League and Covenant taken by the two Houses, and by the Assembly of Divines.—King's Expurgation.—Regulation of the University of Cambridge.—Power of ordaining Ministers vested in the Assembly of Divines.—Directory.

THE departure of the king from Whitehall, and his refusal to resign the command of the militia, were followed by disguised preparations for hostilities, on the side of the king and parliament. Charles gradually withdrew himself from the vicinity of the metropolis, and at last fixed his residence at York. Declarations and remonstrances of justification and recrimination were interchanged, while each party was providing for its security and defence.

The Scottish commissioners, though they had gained all which they proposed for themselves, offered to mediate between the king and his parliament, yet with an evident inclination to the commons. While the king was still at Windsor, they told him that the liberties of England and Scotland must stand or fall together; and they expressed an opinion that the distractions of England

A. D.  
1642.

---

Charles I.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

Jan. 15.

originated in the plots of papists and prelatists, whose aim had been to prevent reformation, and to subvert true and pure religion. To the houses of parliament they returned thanks, for the assistance which they had received in the Scottish troubles, and in return offered their mediation in composing the dissensions of England.

The king rejected this officious interference with indignation, and informed the commissioners that the situation of the two kingdoms was widely different. In Scotland, episcopacy was never fully established, and after a short trial was found to be inconsistent with the character of its people: but in England, it was rooted in the constitution, and had flourished without interruption for eighty years. He therefore commanded them not to interfere between him and his parliament, without a previous and private communication with himself.

The aim of the Scots was not only to abolish the English episcopacy, but, according to an article of the pacification, to bring both kingdoms to an uniformity in religion. To one part of their design the English parliament readily agreed, but not to the other. Yet, as it was impossible that the parliament should succeed in the approaching conflict without the assistance of the Scots, and as that assistance could not be expected but on their own terms, it was expedient to temporize\*.

April 5.

The lords and commons, therefore, issued two documents, almost simultaneously; the one called the NEGATIVE OATH, being a promise not to assist the king, directly or indirectly, against the parlia-

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. ii.

ment, in the present cause; the other, a declaration of their intention to make a reformation in the church, and, for that purpose, of holding a consultation with godly and learned divines. They would use their utmost endeavours to establish learned and preaching ministers throughout the whole kingdom, wherein many dark corners were miserably destitute of the means of salvation, and many poor parishes wanted necessary provision.

A. D.  
1642.  
Charles I.  
April 9.

Before the actual commencement of hostilities, the parliament presented to the king nineteen articles, as the substance of their wishes, or rather demands. The propositions respecting religion were; that the education of the royal offspring should be committed to the superintendence of parliament, or, in the recess of parliament, to the privy council; that the marriages of the royal family should receive a parliamentary sanction; that the penal laws against papists and Jesuits should be strictly executed; that the votes of popish lords in parliament should be taken away while these peers continued in a state of recusancy; and that there should be such a reformation of the church as parliament might advise, having called to its assistance the most pious and learned divines of the kingdom.

Jan. 3.

The two first propositions, concerning the education and marriages of the royal offspring, were indignantly rejected by the king. He had committed his children to the care of persons of quality, integrity, and piety, having especial regard to their education in the principles of the true protestant religion. With the trust which God, nature, and the laws of the land had placed in his

CHAP.  
XXVI.

hands, he would never part. He would not suffer his power of making treaties to be disputed or divided; but he gave his assurances, that he would not entertain any treaty of marriage for his children without a due regard to the protestant religion, and the honour of his family, and that he would take such care of his family as would justify him to God as a father, and to his dominions as a king. Concerning popish recusants, he admitted that, if any more effectual course could be devised of disabling them from disturbing the state, he ought to give his consent to it. As to the votes of popish lords, he was informed that these lords had prudently withdrawn from parliament; therefore he did not conceive that they ought to be excluded by any general law, as their right of sitting was a privilege of blood. But he was contented that they should vote by proxy as long as they refused to conform to the church of England. With respect to a bill for educating the children of papists in the protestant religion, he gave it his decided consent and approbation.

On the great point of contention, the church, both as regarded its government and its worship, the king adhered to his former declarations. He was willing to remove illegal innovations, but he was persuaded in his conscience that no church could be found upon earth more pure than that which was already established. The proposal of calling a national synod, he was willing to take into his consideration; but the government and doctrine of the church of England he was determined to maintain with constancy, not only against

all innovations of popery, but from the irreverence of those numerous schismatics and separatists with which the kingdom had of late abounded \*.

A. D.  
1642.

Charles I.

The parliament now began to cultivate the alliance of the Scots; and since the king had rejected any mediation, the Scottish council sent the same offer through their chancellor to the two houses. The chancellor was received with the greatest respect, and the mediation was not only accepted, but as the general assembly of the kirk of Scotland was about to meet, the assistance and advice of that body were solicited in promoting the work of religious reformation.

The assembly, after giving thanks to God that a desire of reformation had inspired the parliament of England, and after expressing its grief that the reformation had hitherto proceeded so tardily, observed, that the Scottish commissioners, without arrogance or presumption, but with the greatest deference and respect, had signified their earnest desire of a religious unity. They sincerely wished that there might be one confession of faith, one directory of worship, one public catechism, and one form of church government. The assembly was willing to enter on those labours which the commissioners had left unfinished, being encouraged by the zeal of former times, when their predecessors sent a letter into England against the surplice, tippet, and square cap. The assembly was further encouraged by the behaviour of the king during his late residence in Scotland, not only by establishing their worship, but by con-

August 3.

\* Rushworth's Collect. vol. i. part 3.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

forming to it. Still further encouragement was given from a letter sent by many of their reverend brethren of the church of England, promising that their prayers and endeavours should be directed against every thing prejudicial to the establishment of the kingdom of Christ. On all these accounts they were encouraged to advise that uniformity should begin in the article of church government; for "what hope," they inquired, "can there be of one confession of faith, one form of worship and catechism, till prelacy be plucked up root and branch as a plant which God hath not planted? The reformed kirks hold the presbyterian government to be of divine right; but prelacy is almost universally esteemed, even by the prelates themselves, to be a human ordinance. It may therefore be altered or abolished in cases of necessity, without wronging any man's conscience."

These overtures of the general assembly called forth suitable acknowledgments from the parliament, with expressions of a desire for an uniformity in religion. The parliament candidly averred that unity was scarcely to be expected punctually and exactly; but as both nations were guided by the same desire of casting away every thing which was offensive to God, an agreement in all fundamental points might be accomplished. The English so far agreed with the Scottish and other reformed churches, in the substantials of divine worship and discipline, that there ought to be a free communion in all holy exercises and duties, for the attainment of which an assembly of godly divines was to meet as soon as the royal assent could be obtained. On the vital question, that of extirpating prelacy, there

was no difference of opinion. That institution had been the occasion of many intolerable burdens and grievances, and the bishops had always instilled into the minds of English princes notions of arbitrary power. It was therefore resolved, that episcopal government and all its dependencies should be taken away. The address ended with a request that the Scots would concur in a petition to the king for an assembly of divines, and that they would send some of their own ministers to the assembly; that so the way might be opened for establishing one confession of faith and directory of public worship in the three kingdoms.

A. D.  
1642.  
Charles I.

The king received early intelligence of this correspondence, and, aware of its consequences, thought himself justified in sending a warm remonstrance to the council of Scotland. In this document Charles and his advisers evinced their superiority in style and argument. Uniformity in religion, he observed, was not less his wish than theirs; but it must be such an uniformity as would promote the protestant religion. His English parliament, since its first meeting, had never made any proposition to him concerning such an uniformity. "So far," continued the king, "are the English from desiring it, that we are confident the most considerable persons, and those who make the fairest pretensions to you of that kind, are not more inclined to a presbytery, than you are to episcopacy\*. And truly it seems, notwithstanding their professions, that nothing has been farther from their minds than the settlement of true re-

\* Duke of Hamilton's Memoirs, b. 4.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

---

ligion, and the reformation of abuses in the church. Whenever any proposition shall be made to us, which we shall conceive may advance the unity of the protestant religion according to the word of God, or may establish church government according to the laws of the kingdom, we shall let the world see that nothing can be more agreeable to us than to advance so good a work \*.” The king then clearly explained the uniformity which he intended, and justly observed that the English parliament no more believed the divine institution of presbytery, than the general assembly of the kirk of Scotland believed the divine right of diocesan episcopacy. For the purpose of securing the assistance of the Scots, the English parliament had contentedly voted away the power of archbishops and bishops; but if ever it succeeded in conquering the king, and had nothing to fear from its neighbours, it would never consent to the establishment of a presbyterian government, without reserving the power of the keys.

The event proved that the anticipations of Charles were well founded; but the parliament, to convince the Scots of the sincerity of their declaration, brought in a bill to abolish episcopacy. The bill  
Sept. 10. passed both houses, yet not without great art and industry in its framers. To such as were unfriendly to the extirpation of prelacy, but were also unfriendly to a despotic monarchy, it was plausibly urged, that as the two houses were about to submit proposals of peace to the king, it was proper to ask more than was expected to be granted. Since

\* Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, b. 6.



the affection of the king to episcopacy was so well known, it might happen, that to preserve the church, he would give up the militia. For this reason, the bill was not to take effect till more than a year after it had passed; and this circumstance confirms the probability, that in case of a satisfactory accommodation with the king, it was not to take effect at all.

A. D.  
1642.

Charles I.

While the king and the two houses were thus employed in justifying their conduct, the scene of the war began to open. The king, in his speeches and declarations, solemnly promised, as he hoped for the blessing and protection of Heaven, to maintain and defend, to the utmost of his power, the true protestant religion, as it was established in the church of England. On one occasion, which it is not right to omit, he caused his military orders to be read at the head of each regiment, and then, placing himself in the middle of his army, made an address resembling that of the emperor Trajan. The Roman emperor, when he presented Sura, his general, with a sword, said, "Receive this sword from me: if I command as I ought, employ it in my defence; if I do otherwise, draw it against me." The British monarch used these words: "When I fail in what I have promised, I will expect no aid or relief from man, or protection from Heaven; but while I keep my resolution, I hope for the assistance of all good men, and am confident of God's blessing."

So far was the parliament from being agreed in the justice of beginning hostilities, that a majority of the house of lords joined the royal standard. About forty peers, and several members of the

CHAP. house of commons, withdrew to the king, having  
XXVI. signed an engagement to defend the royal person and prerogatives, to support the protestant religion established by law, and not to submit to any ordinance of parliament without the royal assent.

The cause of the king was espoused, with a few exceptions, by the church of England, comprehending the bishops, the cathedral, the parochial clergy, and the two universities. The historians least favourable to ecclesiastical establishments, and to the motives of churchmen, allow that they joined the king, not merely for the sake of their preferments, but because they believed resistance to their sovereign, under any circumstances, to be impious and unlawful\*. Whatever might be the speculative opinions of the English clergy on the origin of civil government, they breathed the spirit of liberty as well as of loyalty. They supported a monarchy limited by law, because such a government is most favourable to freedom. They maintained that the end of human laws is the public good †, and were equally disposed with the Jesuits or the puritans to admit the maxim of Aquinas: "REX PROPTER REGNUM, ET NON REGNUM PROPTER REGEM."

It is impossible to deny that the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance were carried by some divines to an extravagant degree, such as is inconsistent with civil liberty, and that they misapplied the Jewish history to countenance these doctrines; but the same perversion of the sacred writings was practised by the puritan ministers.

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 12. Hume's History of Great Britain, c. 56.

† Sanderson, Prælect. 10.

They blasphemously applied what has been spoken by the prophets against the most wicked and impious kings, to excite the people to overthrow the English monarchy. Most of the puritan ministers joined the parliament, and the most eminent served as chaplains in its army.

A. D.  
1642.

Charles I.

Before the king had erected his standard at Nottingham, the two universities had transmitted their plate and treasure, although that of Cambridge narrowly escaped the vigilance of Cromwell. After the indecisive battle of Edgehill, Oxford, throughout the civil war, was the residence of the king. It was the resort of the court, the seat of government, and the strongest garrison of the royal army; and the generous devotedness of this city to the person and interests of Charles was his best consolation under the most calamitous reverses of his fortune.

August 22.

October.

At no period of her history could Oxford boast of such an assemblage of virtue, talent, and erudition, as was now concentrated within her walls. Once, she was the Athens of England, the nurse of science; now, she was the British Sion, a fortress and a temple. Her gremials rushed with ardour into her gates, to practise those lessons of patriotism and loyalty, which they had formerly been taught, and which they had not learned in vain. To such a phalanx who would not have been eager to unite? With such individuals who would not have been proud to err? Who would shrink from the assertion of principles, for which such men willingly offered their lives?

Pinke, the chief magistrate of the university, the glory of every Wykehamist, possessing all the

CHAP.  
XXVI.

munificence of his founder, had not only trained the students to the use of arms, but had promoted the king's commission of array among the townsmen. Supported by Fell, and by Sheldon, he had admitted the royal troops into the garrison, before the king himself, after his first promising campaign, retired to enjoy a temporary repose from military toil, and to deliberate on his future conduct.

Notwithstanding the influx of statesmen and soldiers, the academical character of the place was retained, and, almost forgetting the cares of government and the veils of faction, Charles could devote his hours to literary conversation. In theology he was more than commonly skilled, and could appreciate the distinguishing merits of the most eminent divines, and reward them with appropriate praise. There, he could contemplate and admire the manly sense of Sanderson, the natural eloquence of Hammond, the recondite erudition of Usher, and the exuberant oratory of Jeremy Taylor. There, in the congenial society of Falkland, he could beguile his misfortunes, or excite his superstitious forebodings, by consulting the Virgilian lots.

The winter being passed in mutual preparations for the renewal of hostilities, the early part of the spring was chiefly remarkable for the treaty at Oxford. To prove that he was not disinclined to receive any overtures, Charles sent a safe conduct to six lords and the same number of commoners, who brought from the two houses propositions of peace. The parliament had circulated these articles long before they were delivered by the authorized commissioners; a circumstance which evinced that no

1643.  
March.

discretionary powers were intrusted to their negotiators, and which consequently lessened the solemnity of the embassy.

A. D.  
1643.

Charles I.

In the preamble of these propositions the point in dispute was assumed ; for the king was accused of being the author of the civil war, by listening to the advice of evil counsellors. The propositions were equally uncompromising with the preamble, and abated nothing of the demands made by the two houses before the beginning of the war. They were fourteen in number, and the fourth was a petition, that the king would give his assent to five bills, which had been passed since the king had left Whitehall. All these bills related to religion. The first was for the suppression of innovations in churches and chapels, for the better observance of the Lord's day, and the better advancement of preaching. The second was to abolish archbishops, bishops, and all other subordinate gradations of the hierarchy. The third was for punishing scandalous ministers, by the appointment of commissioners in every county. The fourth was directed against pluralities. The fifth and last was, for calling an assembly of pious and learned divines, who might settle the government and liturgy of the church.

It was not more than just to himself, that the king should begin his answer to the propositions, by denying the imputation preferred against him of being the author of the war. If his mind were not wholly bent on peace, he could not but resent so false an accusation by immediately breaking off the treaty. But he would not refrain from telling

CHAP.  
XXVI.

his subjects, that their religion, the true protestant religion, was amply settled and established before any army was raised against him. Although many of these propositions were destructive of his just power and prerogatives, yet because they might be mollified or explained in a conference, he was not unwilling that a time and place should be appointed for their further discussion. In the mean time he submitted some counter propositions of his own. The last article in the king's project was a cessation of arms for twenty days; an article which he wished to be adjusted as a preliminary of the treaty.

The negotiations were protracted during three months, and were terminated without the settlement of a single article. Not only were the king and the parliamentary commissioners divided, but the king's friends were not agreed among themselves. The commissioners of the parliament on their return gave an honourable testimony to the civility and condescension of the king. In the various and lengthened discussions, he manifested strength of reasoning, quickness of apprehension, and much patience, in hearing the objections of his opponents\*.

As soon as the treaty was broken off, the commons began to put in execution those five bills to which they had in vain solicited the royal assent. The first of the bills, concerning the removal of innovations and superstitious monuments from places of worship, was acted on with more than literal and legal exactness. The work of destruction was not

\* Whitelocke's Memoirs, p. 65.

confined to churches and chapels, but extended to other monuments of antiquity. A committee, of which sir Robert Harlow was the chairman, took down the crosses of Charing and Cheapside; and Saint Paul's cross, under "whose now idolatrous banner," Ridley, Hooker, and Jewel had once borne their testimony against the corruptions of popery, was included in the general devastation\*.

A. D.  
1643.  
Charles I.  
May.

The bill for abolishing episcopacy was so far carried into effect, that the bishops were deprived of all authority, and the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was vested in a committee of the house of commons. White, a lawyer, better known by the name of White the centurist, was its chairman; "a puritan," says Whitelocke, "from his youth to his death." Assuming the same powers as if the members had been appointed by the king, the committee, under the name of "the committee for the removal of scandalous ministers," commanded the knights of the shires to bring information of the state of religion in their respective counties. The committee in London was authorized to consider the expediency of sending commissioners into all the counties of England, to examine those clergymen against whom accusations had been brought, and who could not, on account of their distance, be conveniently examined in London.

Of this self-constituted court, the character has

\* "The zealous knight," observes Whitelocke with a smile, "took down the cross in Cheapside and Charing impartially." The zeal for pulling down the crosses gave occasion to a humorous piece, called "A Dialogue between the Crosses in Cheap and Charing, comforting each other." Dr. Z. Grey's *Examination of Neal*, vol. ii.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

not been too highly coloured by the loyal historians of the times. By its frame and constitution, it had an authority, not only over the estates and preferments of the clergy, but over their credit and reputation. All the learned and orthodox ministers of England were included under the epithets of scandalous or malignant; and if the meanest and most vicious parishioners which they had, could be brought to prefer a petition against them before the house of commons, they were sure to be prosecuted as such\*. Presentments against the clergy were poured in with such rapidity, that within a short time they amounted to two thousand. The articles of inquiry, on which the committee proceeded, were, 1. scandalous immoralities of life; 2. false and scandalous doctrines, particularly popery and Arminianism; 3. a profanation of the Sabbath, by countenancing the Book of Sports; 4. practising and insisting on the late innovations after they had been censured by parliament; 5. neglect of preaching; and 6. malignancy and disaffection to the parliament†.

It would not be less absurd than false to say, that among so large a body as the English clergy, there were not some individuals of wicked and immoral lives; but it may be safely asserted, that loyalty and orthodoxy were the real cause of their deprivation. Malignancy was the comprehensive and indefinite crime for which the clergy suffered.

As the loyal and episcopal clergy were thus harassed by the committee for scandalous mini-

\* Clarendon.

† Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy. Introduction.



sters, so the puritanical teachers were protected and remunerated by another committee for the relief of plundered ministers. It was formed under the pretence of making a provision for such godly preachers as had suffered loss, either for opposing the king, or adhering to the parliament. This was undoubtedly only a pretext, for it does not appear that the king ever sequestered a single benefice, or dispossessed a single incumbent; but by the connivance of this committee, the livings of many loyal clergymen were filled by men, "some of whom had no goods, and most of them no livings, to lose\*." It was the business and policy of these two committees to act, as they really acted, in concert. The one reported those faultier who were faulty, and those faulty who were faultless; the other brought back, under the specious colour of plundered ministers, the silenced and factious lecturers who, within the last ten years, had left the kingdom for nonconformity and debt†.

A. D.  
1643.  
Charles I.

To redress, as far as it was possible, this systematic persecution, the king issued two proclamations within a week of each other. In his last proclamation, he took notice that the proceedings of the house of commons amounted to a violation of the great charter, which had provided that no ecclesiastical property should be seized or se-

April 7,  
and April  
15.

\* Heylin's History of Presbytery.

† Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy. Introduction. "Their powerful ministers are ignorant, factious, schismatical ministers, or else intruding mechanics, who, without any calling from God or man, stepped from the cobbler's stall, the butcher's board, or the bricklayer's scaffold, into the pulpit, like Sheba's trumpet, summoning the people to rebellion."

CHAP.  
XXVI.

questered but by the ordinary. He had seen with grief that many of the clergy, "eminent for their piety and learning," had been driven and forced from their cures and habitations, and had been dispossessed of their livings, because they had published his lawful and just declarations, or because they continued to conform to the book of common prayer. He therefore prohibited all persons, on their allegiance, from depriving the regular clergy from the use of their own pulpits, or from withholding their tithes and dues. But these proclamations only evinced the king's intentions without stopping the course of the parliament\*.

April 1, and  
August 19.

As a mitigation of the severity, or as a gloss on the injustice, of these sequestrations, an ordinance of the house of commons authorized the commissioners, to allow a fifth part of the revenues of the benefice, to the family of the ejected incumbent. Extravagantly as this measure has been panegyricized, it will not bear examination. The commissioners had a discretionary power of granting or withholding this miserable allowance, and the discretion of such men was seldom exercised in favour of the ejected royalists. The payment of the fifths, even when granted, was left to the discretion of the intruders, and an attempt at legal redress was an aggravation of the calamities suffered by the loyal clergy†.

The grand panacea for all the disorders and

\* Heylin.

† Fuller, who was himself a sufferer, but not unfavourable to the party, is the most unexceptionable witness. "So various were the subterfuges, that, as one truly and sadly said, the *fifths* are paid at *sixes and sevens*."

calamities of the church was now to be applied ; for the assembly of divines, to reform its discipline and liturgy, was summoned. When the bill for this purpose had been refused the royal assent, Cornelius Burgess, at the head of the puritan ministers, applied again to the parliament ; but the two houses were at first unwilling to adopt such a measure without the concurrence of the king. The objections of the parliament were overcome by the Scots, who insisted on an uniformity of doctrine and discipline between the two nations. Thus the two houses were compelled to convert the rejected bill into an ordinance, and to convene the assembly by their own authority.

A. D.  
1643.

Charles I.

The ordinance differed from the bill in two material points : first, that lay assessors were admitted to sit with the divines ; and, secondly, that the assembly was restrained from the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It was only permitted to deliberate on those topics which were proposed by the two houses, and to offer its advice and counsel. Its members were not elected by the clergy, like any other synod, but by the knights of the different shires, who produced to the house of commons a list of such divines within their respective counties as were thought most proper. The assembly was not even intrusted with the choice of its own president or prolocutor, and the chairman was not permitted to nominate his deputy in case of his own unavoidable absence. The appointment of all these functionaries rested with the two houses. To those clerical members named by the knights of the shires, were added, as lay members, ten peers and twenty commoners, who

June 12.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

had an equal power of consulting and voting with the divines. The number of divines chosen amounted to not less than one hundred and twenty; but as many who were originally nominated refused to appear, their vacancies were supplied by the two houses with others, who were called the superadded divines\*.

A few divines, chiefly nominated by the house of peers, were loyalists and episcopalians, and two or three were of the episcopal order; but the far larger part of the assembly consisted of presbyterians. Five divines, who had embraced the principles of the independents, and had sought refuge in Holland, on account of non-conformity, having returned at the opening of the long parliament, were adopted into the assembly, and were distinguished by the name of the dissenting brethren.

June 22.

In the interval between the ordinance and the first meeting, the king issued a proclamation, forbidding the formation of the assembly, and pronouncing all its acts invalid. In defiance of this proclamation, sixty-nine members, on the day previously appointed, met in Henry the Seventh's chapel. The divines appeared, not in their canonical habits, but in coats and bands, in imitation of the foreign protestants. Twisse, the vicar of Newbury, in Berkshire, a divine of supralapsarian principles, was appointed the president†; Burgess

July 1.

\* Heylin's Hist. of Presbytery. Fuller's Church Hist. b. xi.

† He distinguished himself by his writings against Arminianism; he enjoyed the friendship of Joseph Mede, and possessed the esteem of Sanderson. "His plain preaching was esteemed good, his solid disputations were accounted by some better, and his pious way of living was reckoned by others, especially the puritans, best of all." Wood's Athen. Oxon. vol. ii.

and White, two celebrated preachers of the puritans, were his assessors ; and there were two scribes who had no votes.

A. D.  
1643.

Charles I.

Such was the constitution of the assembly: its character must be drawn from the testimony of contemporary writers, and from its own acts. Milton, whose deep-rooted antipathy to prelacy is well known, has left on record his opinion of this synod, although, having incurred its censure on account of his doctrine of divorce, his opinion cannot be deemed unbiassed. His character of the assembly is marked by his usual vigour and roughness. " The most of them were such as had preached, and cried down with great show of zeal, the avarice and pluralities of bishops and prelates, and that one cure of souls was a full employment for one spiritual pastor, how able soever, if not a charge above human strength. Yet these conscientious men, ere any part of the work done, for which they came together, and that on the public salary\*, wanted not boldness, to the ignominy and scandal of their pastor-like profession, and especially of their boasted reformation, to seize into their hands, or not unwillingly to accept, besides one, sometimes two or more of the best livings, collegiate masterships of the universities, rich lectures in the city, setting sails to all winds that might blow gain into their covetous bosoms. By which means these great rebukers of non-residence, among so many distant cures, were not ashamed to be seen so quickly pluralists and non-residents themselves,

\* Four shillings per diem were allowed to each member for his attendance.

CHAP. to a fearful condemnation doubtless by their own  
XXVI. mouths. So that between them the teachers, and these the disciples, there hath not been a more ignominious and mortal wound to faith, to piety, to the work of reformation, nor more cause of blaspheming to the enemies of God's truth, since the first preaching of the reformation \*."

The opinion of Milton was founded on prejudice, and that prejudice was strengthened by personal resentment ; but the opinion of Clarendon, however it might partake of the one, was not biassed by the other. The noble historian asserts, that of one hundred and twenty, of which number the assembly consisted, there were not above twenty who were not declared and avowed enemies of the church of England, some of them infamous in their lives and conversation, most of them of very mean parts in learning, if not of scandalous ignorance. Laud, whose first martyrdom was to see the assembly convened, speaks the same language. "A great part, if not the greater part of them, were Brownists or independents, or New England ministers, if not worse, or at best refractory persons to the doctrine, or discipline, or both, of the church of England established by law, and now brought together to reform it. An excellent conclave ! This, without God's infinite mercy, will bring forth a schism fierce enough to rend and tear religion out of the country †."

These testimonies may be considered as extravagant, if not false ; but there are others, proceed-

\* Character of the Long Parliament and Assembly.

† Laud's Diary.

ing from different sources, which even the enemies of the synod will not be unwilling to accept with proper limitations. That the reputation of the assembly was not high, or rather, that it was dubious, is admitted by the historian of puritanism \*. Baxter, who was thoroughly acquainted with its component parts, though not one of the body, affirms, that its members were men of eminent learning, godliness, ministerial abilities, and fidelity; and that, since the days of the apostles, no council could be compared with it, except the synod of Dort†. Those who think with veneration, and those who think with disparagement, of the synod of Dort, will not be offended with the comparison.

A. D.  
1643.  
Charles I.

Into this assembly of ill-assorted materials, and incongruous construction, came, as lay assessors, Selden, Glynne, and Whitelocke. Selden had no great affection for the clerical order, however he might venerate the abilities and virtues of some particular churchmen. In the assembly of divines he found, for the most part, sciolists in theology, and novices in law. Most of its members, drawn from that obscurity for which their moderate talents had fitted them, were elated with their new distinction, and assumed an unbecoming mien of importance. These well-intentioned men, in their simplicity, thought that a portable English Bible was the best synodical enchiridion, and that, when armed with such a weapon, they must be invincible.

\* "I believe no set of clergy, since the beginning of Christianity, have suffered so much in their persons and characters." Neal. "And no set of clergy ever deserved it more." Dr. Z. Grey.

† Baxter's Life and Times.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

Selden enjoyed a malicious pleasure in confuting them in their own learning; and when any of them cited a text of Scripture, he would reply: "Perhaps in your little pocket bibles, with gilt leaves, the passage may be as you quote it; but in the Greek or Hebrew it is otherwise\*."

But a more correct judgment may be formed of the character of the assembly from its acts and proceedings, than from the contradictory representations of historians. After a sermon had been delivered by the prolocutor, in the presence of the two houses, and after the adjustment of some preliminary forms, the parliament sent an order to the assembly to begin its labours by a review of the thirty-nine articles of the church; and, in return, the assembly petitioned the parliament for permission to celebrate a fast before the commencement of its labours. A request so reasonable was readily granted, and the parliament and the assembly joined in the observance of the solemnity.

July 21.

A committee was next appointed, to consider the necessary amendments in the doctrinal articles of the church of England; and it was the aim of those who were employed in the revisal, to render their sense more determinate and express in favour of Calvinism†. When ten weeks had been consumed in reviewing and correcting the first fifteen articles, the business was interrupted by the arrival of the Scottish commissioners, and was never resumed.

The military affairs of the parliament were in

\* Whitelocke's Mem. p. 68.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. c. 2.



so unpromising a condition, that an earnest application had been made to the Scots for assistance; but this aid was not granted, unless the two nations would bind themselves by a solemn obligation, that all things should be done in God's house according to his will. Having consulted on a proper form, they sent delegates to the assembly at Westminster, and transmitted their own league and covenant to be taken by the people of England.

A. D.  
1643.  
Charles I.

When the Scottish commissioners came to London, they presented the covenant to the two houses; and they referred its consideration to the assembly of divines. The chief part of the assembly, being presbyterians, could not object to a covenant which engaged to extirpate popery and prelacy; but the episcopalians united with the independents, in opposing an instrument which asserted the divine right of presbytery.

Among the few episcopalians was Featley, formerly a chaplain of archbishop Abbot, and now rector of Lambeth; a divine whose attachment to doctrinal Calvinism and episcopal government was equally strong. He boldly declared, that he could not abjure prelacy absolutely, since he had sworn to obey his bishop in all things lawful and honest. It was therefore proposed by him, that there might be a qualification of the article which related to its extirpation; but his proposal was negatived\*. Cornelius Burgess objected to several parts of the covenant on other grounds; but, after experiencing the indignation of his brethren on account of his

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. c. 2. For a character of Featley, the reader is referred to Neal, Heylin, and Clarendon.

---

**CHAP.  
XXVI.**

contumacy, he was with difficulty prevailed on to consent. Twisse, the prolocutor, and some others, declared in favour of a primitive episcopacy, or of a president over a certain number of presbyters, and refused to subscribe until a parenthesis was inserted, explanatory of the kind of prelacy which it was intended to extirpate. The amendments of the episcopalians were all rejected; but the independents had sufficient weight in the assembly to carry some of their own alterations. Sir Henry Vane caused the word league in the title to be added to that of covenant, thinking that the one was not of such an indissoluble nature as the other. In the first article, he succeeded in inserting a general phrase, of promoting reformation according to the word of God; by which insertion the English thought themselves secure from presbyterian tyranny. The Scots did not oppose the addition, relying on a subsequent clause, of reforming according to the practice of the best reformed churches, in which presbyterian government was incontrovertibly established. When the covenant was read before the house of lords, in order to obtain the assent of that body, it was distinctly explained, that by prelacy every kind of episcopal government was not intended to be abjured, but only the kind specified in the article. The kind of prelacy there mentioned was church government by archbishops, bishops, deans, and chapters, archdeacons, and all other officers dependent upon them. Thus the articles were differently interpreted by the English and Scots, and the ambiguities of their phraseology favoured this difference of interpretation.

With these amendments, the covenant was subscribed by the two houses of parliament and by the assembly. It was then printed and published by authority, as a solemn league and covenant for the reformation and defence of religion, the happiness of the king, and the peace and safety of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland. A day was appointed, and observed with great solemnity, for its subscription by the two houses, the assembly, and the Scottish commissioners; and it was commanded to be taken throughout England by all persons above the age of eighteen years.

A. D.  
1643.  
Charles I.

Sept. 25.

Before the covenant had received the assent of the assembly, all the episcopal divines had left it, except Featley; but he continued to attend, until his correspondence with archbishop Usher, at Oxford, was discovered. The king had sent an order, through Usher, prohibiting him from sitting in the assembly, and the answer of Featley to Usher was intercepted. On this discovery, he was committed to the house of lord Petre as a spy, his livings were sequestered, and he was formally expelled the assembly.

The king could not be unacquainted with this assumption of the supreme authority in ecclesiastical matters, especially as the two houses had commanded the covenant to be taken throughout the kingdom. As soon as he was certified that it had been subscribed by the parliament, the assembly, and the laity and clergy within the bills of mortality, he had recourse to a proclamation. Observing that the engagement, under specious expressions of piety and religion, was nothing more than a traitorous combination against the laws; he

Oct. 9.

**CHAP.  
XXVI.**

strictly forbade all his subjects from taking it, on their allegiance. The same proclamation was sent into Scotland, to which the states of that kingdom showed no further regard, than to return an answer of justification, which concluded by advising the king to take the covenant himself.

This instrument was a new weapon placed in the hands of the enemies of the church, since it enabled them, without any further process, to detect the loyalist and the episcopalian. A simple refusal of the covenant was a convincing proof of malignancy, and was a sufficient ground of deprivation of all ecclesiastical benefices, and of deposition from the ministry. The English in foreign countries were not exempted from this test; and at home, those who refused it were incapable of any civil or military trust.

Among other calumnies propagated against the king, the most successful was his inclination to popery; an aspersion which the fatal friendship of the Romanists to his cause contributed to strengthen. To refute this calumny, Charles thought it necessary to make a solemn expurgation of himself from the errors of the church of Rome, and a declaration of his sincerity in the protestant faith. At the time when he was about to receive the holy eucharist from the hands of Usher, in the cathedral of Christ-church, he rose from his knees, and giving a sign to the archbishop for a short pause, made the following address:

“ My lord, I espy here many resolved protestants, who may declare to the world the resolution which I do now make. I have, to the utmost of my power, prepared my soul to become a worthy

receiver; and may I so receive comfort from the blessed sacrament, as I do intend the establishment of the true reformed protestant religion, as it stood in its beauty in the happy days of queen Elizabeth, without any connivance at popery. I bless God, that, in the midst of these public distractions, I have still liberty to communicate. And may this sacrament be my damnation, if my heart do not join with my lips in this protestation\*.”

A. D.  
1643.

Charles I.

The campaign of this year being ended without any prospect of peace, both parties endeavoured to strengthen themselves by engrossing all the functions of civil government. The parliament wanted, if not a king, yet a supreme authority, and the king wanted a parliament. The want of a king, the two houses supplied by a counterfeit great seal, which they affixed to their ordinances, and by this device they exercised every act of executive government which policy might suggest, or necessity dictate. On the other hand, the king commanded the courts of justice to be removed to Oxford, and at length resolved to use his undoubted prerogative of summoning his parliament to attend him there. The proclamation of the king was obeyed by all those members who had been expelled, or had voluntarily seceded from the two houses at Westminster. The parliament at Oxford was attended by a large majority of the house of peers, and by a proportion of the house of commons not contemptible. Had the king suffered this rival,

April 16.

\* Rushworth's Collection, and Rapin's History of England, vol. ii. folio.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

or rather, this legal parliament to continue its deliberations, he might have prevented the dissolution of the constitution ; but the baleful influence of the queen and her faction, or his love of arbitrary power, induced him speedily to command its prorogation \*.

Throughout the remaining part of the civil war, the city of Oxford continued to be the seat of royalty, while the town of Cambridge was the centre of seven counties associated in the cause of the parliament†. The town of Cambridge was always devoted to the parliamentary interest ; but the university showed an equal attachment to the king. The colleges were so many sanctuaries of loyalty ; the university press was under the king's control ; and the university pulpit resounded with exhortations against rebellion. It was therefore deemed expedient to dispossess a body of academicians so manifestly opposed to the parliamentary opinions in government and religion, and to supply the vacancy by men of republican or presbyterian principles.

1644.  
January 22.

By an ordinance of the two houses, a committee was appointed for the regulation of the university of Cambridge, and at its head was placed lord Kimbolton, who had lately succeeded to the earl-

\* " There is no circumstance which bears harder on the king's conduct than this. I doubt that this is too strong a proof that nothing less than arbitrary government would heartily satisfy him." Bishop Warburton. See his letter to the queen, in Rushworth's Collection, vol. v. and Rapin's History of England, vol. ii. folio.

† Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Hertford, and Lincoln.

dom of Manchester. If any man could render an invidious office less galling, by the gentleness of his disposition, it was this nobleman. Driven into the republican faction by connexion rather than choice, he never forgot or disgraced his high extraction: The earl repaired in person to Cambridge, attended by his two chaplains, and by his warrant required the heads of the several colleges to send their statutes to him, with the names of their members, distinguishing the residents from the absentees. Another warrant was then issued, commanding the return of such as were absent, within a limited time, on pain of imprisonment and sequestration of their offices. Absence, from whatever cause, was punished by ejectment; and ten heads of colleges, with sixty-five fellows, were immediately dispossessed and expelled.

A. D.  
1644.

Charles I.

Feb. 24.

March 10.

To eject all absentees, without discriminating the reason of their absence, was the most compendious mode of expulsion; but such as could not be removed on this plea were obliged to submit to the test of the covenant. The commissioners of regulation ventured not to offer this test to the whole university, lest it should have been rejected with scorn; but it was tendered to the members separately, and to such as had rendered themselves conspicuous by their hostility to the parliament.

After the departure of Manchester, the regulation of the university was undertaken by a committee, and the number of expulsions amounted to two hundred. Out of sixteen heads of colleges, twelve were dispossessed; and among these the names of Cosins, Comber, Ward, and Stern, are a sufficient evidence, that neither popery and Armi-

CHAP.  
XXVI.

nianism on the one hand, nor ignorance and immorality on the other, was the cause of their ejection. The treatment of Ward\* was heightened in cruelty by many circumstances, and, like the sufferings of Featley, was aggravated by his attachment to doctrinal Calvinism. But his Calvinistic opinions, in the judgment of the commissioners, were not sufficient to protect him from the punishment due to loyalty. As soon as the war began, he had actively contributed to the necessities of the king. Previously to the regulation, he had experienced the insults of the garrison, and, with some other governors of the university, had been confined in the senate-house a whole night, without food or fire, or any accommodation, because the senate had refused to assist the two houses in a war against their sovereign. When the university was purified, Ward was deprived of all his academical dignities, and imprisoned; and during his confinement contracted a disease which terminated his life, six weeks after his release†.

Sterne‡, Beale§, and Martin|| were seized by Cromwell, and carried in triumph to London, and, in defiance of an order from the house of lords, directing their confinement in the Tower, were taken from prison to prison, and during ten days were kept in the noisome hold of a ship. They never were brought to a trial, and were at last set

\* He was master of Sidney-Sussex college, and Margaret professor in divinity, and had been one of the divines sent by James to the synod of Dort.

† Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy.

‡ Master of Jesus.

§ Master of St. John's.

|| Master of Queen's.



at liberty, after an imprisonment of several years, when they were permitted to live in obscurity and poverty.

A. D.  
1644.

---

Charles I.

Into the offices, from which the loyal divines were ejected, three divines were placed, on whom an eulogy would be a waste of words : Cudworth, pre-eminent in metaphysical theology ; Lightfoot, a complete master of oriental learning ; and Whichcote, celebrated for his useful and practical expositions of Scripture. Yet their acceptance of these offices, when connected with their conformity at the restoration, proves nothing in favour of puritanical principles. They submitted to the power of the dominant party, and either compromised their real opinions, or asserted them with the connivance of the ruling authorities\*.

The effects of the regulation of the university on its learning and religion are thus faithfully and feelingly described by an eye-witness and a sufferer. “ These reformers reduced a glorious and renowned university to a mere Munster ; and did more, in less than three years, than the apostate Julian could effect in his reign ; namely, broke the heart-strings of learning and of all learned men, and thereby luxated all the joints of Christianity. We are not afraid to appeal to any impartial judge, whether, if the Goths and Vandals, or even the Turks themselves, had overrun the nation, they would have more inhumanly abused a flourishing university than these pretended advancers of religion have done ; having thrust out the eyes of this

\* It is said that Whichcote never took the covenant, and, by his interest with the commissioners, prevailed that the test should not be offered to any of the fellows of King's College.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

kingdom, made eloquence dumb, philosophy sottiſh, widowed the arts, drove the muses from their ancient habitation, plucked the reverend and orthodox ministers out of their chairs, and silenced them in prison or in their graves, turned religion into rebellion, changed the apostolical chair into a desk of blasphemy, tore the garland from the head of learning to fix it on the dull brows of disloyal ignorance, and unhived those numerous swarms of labouring bees, which used to drop honey dews over all this kingdom, to place in their room swarms of senseless drones\*.”

While the earl of Manchester secured the university of Cambridge to the parliament, he appointed commissioners for the removal of scandalous, or rather, royal ministers from the seven associated counties. Instructions were given to the committees for ascertaining the political and religious opinions of the clergy; and when any clergyman was convicted of disaffection to the parliament, a report was made to the earl, and a warrant was issued by him, commanding the churchwardens of the parish to eject the delinquent from the benefice.

To fill these vacant benefices, and to provide a succession of ministers, was not an easy task, especially until it was settled with whom the power of ordination rested. A violent struggle took place between the presbyterians and the independents; but a triumph was at last obtained by the former. By an ordinance of the two houses, ten presbyters were selected from the assembly of divines, and to these were added thirteen chosen from the city of

\* *Querela Cantabrigiensis*, pp. 2. 26.

London. To show that the religion of the nation was not intended to degenerate into independency, a clause was inserted in the ordinance, that if any person presumed to preach in public, or to exercise any ministerial function, who had not been ordained or approved by the authorized presbytery, the name of the offender should be reported to the parliament, that he might receive a due punishment.

A. D.  
1644.

Charles I.

After having made this temporary provision for a ministerial succession, it was the care of the assembly to provide a general form of divine worship. The liturgy had been disused for more than a year past, but no other form had yet been substituted. Several projects were proposed, but were laid aside; and nothing can be alleged in excuse for destroying one building without erecting another, except the unwillingness of the parliament to adopt the discipline of the Scots, or their desire to form some accommodation with the king\*.

A committee was at length appointed, to agree on certain general heads, for the direction of every minister in the discharge of his office; and this form was afterwards confirmed by an ordinance of the two houses, under the title of "A Directory for Public Worship." The motives which induced the parliament to sanction a new model of public worship were detailed in a preface. "It is evident," is the language of the Directory, "after long and sad experience, that the liturgy used in the church of England, notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers, has

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. c. 4.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

proved an offence to many of the godly at home, and to the reformed churches abroad. The enjoining the reading of all the prayers heightened the grievances; and the many unprofitable and burdensome ceremonies have occasioned much mischief, by disquieting the consciences of many who could not yield to them. Sundry good people have, by this means, been kept from the Lord's table, and many faithful ministers debarred from the exercise of their ministry, to the ruin of themselves and their ministry. The prelates and their faction have raised their estimation of it to such a height, as if God could be worshipped in no other way but by the Service Book; in consequence of which, the preaching of the word has been depreciated, and in some places entirely neglected. In the mean time, the papists have made their advantage of this way, boasting that the Common Prayer came up to a compliance with a great part of their service; by which means they were not a little confirmed in their idolatry and superstition, especially of late, when new ceremonies were daily obtruded on the church. Besides, the liturgy has given great encouragement to an idle and unedifying ministry, who chose rather to confine themselves to forms made to their hands, than to exert themselves in the exercise of the gift of prayer, with which our Saviour furnishes all whom he calls to that office\*."

The Directory, as its name imports, was not a prescribed form of public worship, but was intended as a guide to the minister, though much was left

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, Appendix, No. 8.

to his talents or inspiration. It comprised rules, arranged under different heads, relating to public prayer, preaching, the administration of the sacraments, and other divine offices. As it was drawn up by presbyterian ministers, it contained the peculiarities of the presbyterian discipline.

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

When it was first submitted to the assembly, it experienced some opposition from the independents, as being an infringement on the liberty of prayer, and on the "liberty of prophesying." But an almost unanimous agreement was at last secured, by qualifying some objectionable phrases in the preface. Thus, the presbyterians, who preferred a prescribed form, might be gratified by a rigid adherence to the letter of the Directory; and the independents, who claimed a discretionary latitude for each teacher, might deviate from it, as they thought fit.

It may not be uninteresting to notice some of the chief peculiarities in this new formulary. Instead of any stated prayers, the Directory suggested topics of prayer. To read the Scriptures in the congregation was declared to be necessary; but how large a portion should be read was left to the judgment of the minister. Ordinarily, one chapter of the Old Testament was recommended, and the most edifying books were to be read most frequently. None of the apocryphal books were permitted to be read.

Preaching was become the chief part of the ministerial office; and on this head the instructions of the Directory were copious and particular. The preacher was directed in a proper choice of his subject, in the analysis and division of his text, and in deducing useful and practical inferences.

CHAP.  
XXVI.

The chief divisions in the assembly took place concerning the administration of the sacraments. Private and lay baptism, with the use of sponsors, were rejected. Immersion was forbidden, and sprinkling declared to be sufficient; and a clause to that effect was inserted in the Directory, by the suggestion of Lightfoot. The communion of the Lord's supper was enjoined to be celebrated frequently, but how often was not specified. The time recommended for its administration was immediately after the morning sermon. The altar with rails was to be converted into a table, placed in the middle of the church; about or around which the people were to sit or stand, when they communicated. It was intended by the presbyterians, that the minister should have a power of repelling any unworthy communicant; but Lightfoot and Selden pleaded for an open communion. Their opinion was adopted; and it was resolved, that the minister, without refusing to any participation of the sacred rite, should warn the profane and impenitent not to approach the Lord's table.

Marriage, though not a sacrament, was esteemed a religious ordinance, and was to be celebrated by a lawful minister of the word. The use of the ring in the ceremony was laid aside. Instructions were given in the Directory for the visitation of the sick, but for the burial of the dead no service was appointed. The corpse was to be decently attended to the place of sepulture, and to be interred without further ceremony.

The ancient fasts and festivals of the church were abrogated; for, according to the Directory, "there is no day commanded by Scripture to be

kept holy, but only the Lord's day, which is the Christian sabbath." But the ecclesiastical authorities had a power of appointing both fasts and festivals, the strict observance of which was required.

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

In the scale of religious duties, acts of mortification held a higher rank than acts of charity; and fasting was the fashion of the age. At the commencement of the war, a monthly fast was instituted, to which every festival yielded. The pietists of these times appeared to have forgotten, that a fast might be perverted to promote "strife and debate," as a feast might be abused to the purposes of sensuality and licentiousness.

In the year when the Directory was established, the festival of Christmas happened to fall on the day of the monthly fast; and as both could not be observed, the two houses thought that the fast should take place of the festival. Some of the most eminent divines among the presbyterians and independents thought that the festival should be entirely abolished; and the preacher before the house of lords thus triumphantly anticipated the event: "This day is commonly called Christmas-day; a day that has been heretofore much abused to superstition and profaneness. It is not easy to say, whether the superstition or the profaneness has been greater. So great have they been, that there is no other way to reform it, than by dealing with it as Hezekiah did with the brazen serpent. This year, God by his providence has buried the feast in a fast, and I hope it will never rise again\*."

\* Calamy's Sermon before the House of Lords.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

**Trial and Execution of Laud.—Treaty of Uxbridge.—Army new modelled, and abandoned by the Presbyterian Chaplains.—Ruin of the King's Cause, and Termination of the first Civil War.—King surrenders his Person to the Scottish Army.—The Army removes to Newcastle.—Controversy between the King and Alexander Henderson on Episcopacy.—Death of Henderson.**

CHAP.  
XXVII.

---

ON the day after the Directory was established by an ordinance of the two houses, Laud received sentence of death. More than three years had elapsed since his commitment to the Tower, before he was brought to a trial; and he might have been forgotten, and permitted to die in peace, if the coalition of the English and Scots had not revived his remembrance. The life of Laud was the price which the English freely gave to propitiate the Scots.

It has been alleged that Laud, conscious of guilt, never petitioned for a trial; but it is less surprising that he should not have petitioned for a trial, than that he should have acknowledged the authority of the court which sat in judgment on him. But in all probability he was prompted by many motives to consent that his cause should be brought to a public, if not a fair hearing. He was confident in his legal innocence; he was confident in his own skill in disputation, which might be converted to advantage in a forensic defence.



When he was first committed, he continued to exercise his archiepiscopal functions until he was prohibited by an order from the house of lords; and he incurred the resentment of that house, by refusing to institute their nominee in preference to that of the king. The incensed peers sent a message to the commons to hasten his trial, and a measure, which was perhaps adopted only to intimidate the archbishop, was gladly converted by his enemies to his destruction. A committee was immediately appointed, and Prynne, the ancient enemy of Laud, was its solicitor. To him belonged the task of collecting and arranging the evidence, and he forcibly carried away the private papers, the diary, and even the written defence, of the prisoner. The diary of Laud, garbled and mutilated by Prynne, was published by an order of the house of commons. Although the publication of this document produced the effect intended by the enemies of Laud, yet it will be regarded differently by the impartial judgment of posterity. The worst of the crimes of which he was accused falls infinitely short of the malice and baseness which could thus expose his secret frailties.

A. D.  
1644.

Charles I.

1643.  
May 31.

At the expiration of six months, the committee had added ten articles to those fourteen which had been originally presented; but another four months passed away before both parties were ready for trial.

Oct. 23.

1644.  
March 4.

The house of lords was now reduced to about twenty members, of whom scarcely more than twelve attended; and lord Grey, of Werk, who acted as speaker of the house, presided. The managers, on the part of the commons, were serjeant Wild, Maynard, Brown, Nicholas, and

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Hill; each of whom has been portrayed by Laúd in harsh but not distorted features. Of Maynard he has candidly said, "This gentleman pleaded strongly, yet fairly against me." The prisoner was allowed counsel to speak to points of law; but on points of fact he conducted his defence without legal aid. The spirit and ability with which he repelled the accusations urged against him are proved by the testimony of Prynne\*.

On the first day of the trial, serjeant Wild opened the proceedings, in which he stated the articles of impeachment, and aggravated the crimes of the prisoner. "This man," said Wild, at the conclusion of his long speech, "is like Naaman, the Syrian, a great man, but a leper."

March 12. The archbishop replied in a speech which had been previously prepared, and which he read from a paper. He said, that he considered it a heavy grievance to appear in the place where he then stood, and to plead for himself on such an occasion; because he was not only a Christian but a clergyman, and advanced to the highest dignity in the English church. He blessed God that he was neither ashamed to live, nor afraid to die; that he had been a strict observer of the laws of his country; and as to his religion, he had been a steady member of the church as it was established by law.

\* "He made as full, as gallant, and as pithy a defence, and spoke as much for himself as it was possible for the wit of man to invent, and that with so much art, sophistry, vivacity, oratory, audacity, and confidence, without the least blush or acknowledgment of guilt in any thing, as argued him rather obstinate than innocent, impudent than penitent, and a far better orator and sophister than protestant and Christian."

He had been as far from attempting any alterations in favour of popery as when he was first born. "Let nothing be spoken but truth, and I do hereby challenge whatever is between heaven and hell, that can be said against me in point of my religion, in which I have ever hated dissimulation." Such was the challenge of Laud, and he recited a list of twenty-one persons whom he had converted from popery to the church of England.

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

The articles of impeachment may be reduced to three general heads: first, that the archbishop had attempted to subvert the rights of parliament, and to exalt the king's power above the law; secondly, that he had traitorously endeavoured to subvert the laws and government of the realm, and to introduce an arbitrary government; and, thirdly, that he had endeavoured to subvert God's true religion, and instead thereof to set up popish superstition and idolatry, by reconciling England to the church of Rome.

I. To substantiate the first charge, the managers produced a passage out of his own diary, stating that a resolution was voted at the board to assist the king in extraordinary ways, if the parliament should prove peevish and refractory. The archbishop replied that this was the vote of the whole council table of which he was only a single member, and therefore could not be called his counsel.

Another expression occurring in one of his private papers was produced, where he said that "MAGNA CHARTA had an obscure birth, and was fostered by an evil nurse." But the archbishop answered, that no disgrace was brought on MAGNA CHARTA by saying that its birth was obscure.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

The truth of the observation is confirmed by English histories and law books, and almost in the same expression which he had used. "And shall the same words," asked Laud, "be history and law in them, but treason in me\*?"

Omitting some passages in two speeches framed by the archbishop to be spoken by the king in parliament, in which he followed his instructions, and which could not be legally charged on himself, it is necessary to mention another charge, brought on the sole testimony of sir Henry Vane. The ex-secretary charged the archbishop with having said at the council table, when the parliament was so abruptly dissolved, that now the king might make use of his own power. Indignant at such an accusation, the archbishop solemnly protested, that he did not remember the words; that, if he did speak them, they were not treasonable; or, if they were treasonable, he ought to have been impeached within a limited time after they were spoken. "But last of all," said the archbishop, "let it be remembered for sir Henry Vane's honour, that he, being a man in years, has so good a memory that he alone can remember words spoken at a full council table which no person of honour remembers except himself. But I would not have him brag of it; for I have read in Saint Augustine, that some, even of the worst men, have had great memories, and were so much the worse for having them. God bless sir Henry!"

The archbishop was also charged with having said, that the parliament might not meddle with

\* History of Laud's Troubles.

religion without the assent of the clergy in convocation. Now, if this were the case, the managers observed, we should have had no reformation; for the bishops and clergy dissented. In answer, the archbishop cited the statute of Elizabeth \*, which leaves the determination of heresy to the parliament with the assent of the clergy in convocation; whence he concluded, that the parliament could not by law determine the truth of any doctrine without the same assent. The managers could not but agree with him as to heresy, yet they disputed his inference with respect to doctrine. But he added, in confirmation of his assertion, that it was the prerogative of the church alone to distinguish between true and false doctrine, though the power of making laws for the punishment of heresy and error belonged to the parliament with the assent of the clergy. In truth, the king and parliament, by their absolute power, might change Christianity into Mahometanism, and the subjects who could not conscientiously submit must fly; but of right they could not make such a change without the consent of the church. Thus the parliament, in the beginning of queen Elizabeth's reign, by absolute power, abolished popish superstition; but when a form of doctrine was to be settled, a synod was called, and the articles there concluded were confirmed in parliament. This rule gave to all parties their just due: a rule so evident, that even the heathens could see its justice; for Lucullus says, in Tully, that the priests were judges of religion, and the senate of law.

A. D.  
1644.

Charles I.

\* Stat. 1 Eliz. c. 1.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

It was also alleged, that, on a reference between the schoolmaster of Saint Paul's and the Mercers' company, the archbishop had said, that the company could not dispossess the schoolmaster without the consent of his ordinary; and, when an act of parliament was cited, he had said, "I will rescind all acts which are against the canons, and I hope shortly to see the canons and the king's prerogative of equal force with an act of parliament."

This charge was made on the oath of a very questionable witness: but the archbishop, repressing his indignation, contented himself with answering, that as no person, by the canon, can keep school without the bishop's licence, it follows that he may not be turned out without the bishop's knowledge and approbation. He was never so absurd as to affirm that the canons and the king's prerogative were of equal authority with acts of parliament; since he has lived to see many canons rejected, and the king's prerogative called in question, which cannot be the case with any act of parliament.

II. In support of the second head, the managers adduced several instances. His illegal enforcement of tonnage and poundage, and of ship-money, and other imposts not sanctioned by parliament, were mentioned; yet, however zealous the archbishop might be in enforcing the payment of these duties, their legality had been previously decided by the judges.

After some charges of inferior magnitude, he was accused of having made alterations in the coronation oath, and of having introduced into that ceremony several unwarrantable innovations,

and into the king's oath some dangerous clauses. The archbishop answered, that for the ceremonial used at the coronation he was not responsible; the present king was anointed and crowned by his predecessor; and the objectionable clauses in the oath were not inserted by him, neither were they inserted at that time, but the oath was framed at the coronation of Edward the Sixth or Elizabeth. At all events, it was the oath which had been taken by James. The other alterations were confessed by the managers themselves to be immaterial; but of whatever nature they might be, they were not made by him, but by the committee of management appointed to conduct the ceremonial.

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

The managers proceeded to charge the archbishop with endeavouring to set up an independent power in the church, and to exempt the clergy from the civil magistrate; and in support of it were mentioned his forbidding to carry the sword upright in the church, making the bishop of London lord treasurer, and saying in the court of high commission that no constable should meddle with a cleric.

This charge the archbishop contradicted in general terms. He had never intended to bring the temporal power under the spiritual, nor to exempt the clergy from obedience to the civil government. But he acknowledged that he had endeavoured to protect the clergy from the oppressions of the laity. "*Vis laica* had been an old and a just complaint, and," said the archbishop, "I took this to be my duty, assuring myself that God did not raise me to a place of eminence to sit still, and see his ministers discountenanced and trampled upon." The particular instances charged

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Dec. 14.

against him as crimes, he proved were nothing more than reasonable injunctions, intended for the promotion of piety, and the preservation of ecclesiastical discipline.

Under this head, the managers objected against the archbishop the continuance of the convocation after the parliament was dissolved, the imposition of an oath, and the enactment of canons; all of which had been since voted by the two houses of parliament to be contrary to the king's prerogative, to the fundamental laws of the realm, to the rights of parliament, and to the property and liberty of the subject.

It was answered, that the sitting of the convocation, after the dissolution of parliament, was, in the opinion of the highest legal authorities, previously consulted, according to law; that, as the convocation was assembled by a different writ from that by which the bishops were summoned to parliament, so it was not dissolved unless by a separate writ. As for the oath so much censured, it was not contrary to law, or else the convocation was misled by such precedents as were never before liable to exception. In the canons made in the reign of king James, there was an oath prescribed against simony, and another for marriage licences, and a third to be taken by judges of ecclesiastical courts; and all these oaths were established by the sole authority of the king and the convocation. It was not for him to speak of the vote passed by the two houses of parliament with disrespect, or to arraign the equity of their decision; but he could not forbear to say, that the canons were passed in an open and full convoca-



tion, and were therefore not the acts of an individual. "They cannot," says the archbishop, "be ascribed to me as president of the synod, and by me they were not made."

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

III. The third general head relating to religion contains the chief points in controversy between the non-conformists and the church of England, and the arguments of each side are displayed in their full force. This general charge was subdivided into two branches: first, that the archbishop had introduced and practised certain popish innovations and popish ceremonies not warranted by law, nor agreeable to the practice of the English church since the reformation; secondly, that he had countenanced and encouraged certain doctrinal errors, savouring of Arminianism and popery, with a view of effecting a reconciliation of the church of England with Rome.

In proof of the first branch of the charge were urged, his setting up images and paintings in places of religious worship; his reparation of the popish paintings in his own chapel at Lambeth; his erection of crucifixes in those churches over which he had an immediate authority; his consecration of the church of Saint Catherine's, in the city of London, at which he used various superstitious rites; his erection of a statue of the Virgin on Saint Mary's church in Oxford, to which, after his example, the people paid reverence as they passed the streets.

The archbishop replied, first, in general terms, that crucifixes and images in churches were not unlawful, and that their historical use was allowed even by Calvin; and he appealed likewise to the

CHAP.  
XXVII.

homilies for the historical use of images. As to the particular allegations, he allowed that he had repaired the windows of the chapel at Lambeth; but the paintings, for the most part, were taken from the scriptural history. He had repaired the fragments of paintings which had been executed before the reformation, but if they had been painted originally by his order, he was not aware that he was thereby guilty of any crime. The statue of the Virgin, at Saint Mary's, in Oxford, was not set up by himself, but by bishop Owen, and there was no complaint ever brought to himself of any homage being paid to this statue. In the ceremonial of consecrating churches, he had not borrowed from the Romish pontifical, but from a form prepared by bishop Andrews.

A further charge was, that the archbishop had ordered, in all the parish churches throughout his diocese, the communion table to be removed from the middle of the church to the eastern end, to be placed in the form of an altar close to the wall, and to be fenced by rails. In the reply made by the archbishop, he showed that the injunctions of queen Elizabeth had directed that the table should be so placed; and the custom had been invariably observed in all cathedral, collegiate, and many parochial churches. Those who transgressed the injunctions, and not those who obeyed them, ought to be charged with innovation. Besides, altars, both in name and thing, were in use in the primitive churches, long before popery began; and that there was no popery in fencing the altar with rails, he had abundantly proved in a speech delivered in the star chamber.

In addition, the archbishop was accused of bowing towards the altar; of bowing at the name of Jesus; of reading the second service at the communion table when there was no sacrament; of standing up at the doxology, and of introducing the use of copes and choral music. It was also objected, that the statutes which he had framed for the university of Oxford were either superstitious or arbitrary.

A. D.  
1644.

Charles I.

These frivolous objections the archbishop briefly answered. He said that genuflexion at the altar, or at the name of Jesus, was an ancient and decorous custom; and though standing at the doxology was not prescribed by the canons of the church, it was, nevertheless, sanctioned by antiquity. The reading of the second service at the altar was not an innovation, and it had been the constant practice in cathedrals, as it was warranted by the rubric. The use of copes was enjoined by one of the canons of king James, and was not an innovation, any more than the use of organs, which had been generally approved by the church of England. "As to the statutes of the university of Oxford," said the archbishop, "it is honour more than enough for me, that I have finished and settled them; nor did I any thing in them but with the consent of the university, nor is there any thing contained in them which is contrary to the university charters, and to its ancient usages."

Lastly, the archbishop was accused of advising the king to publish the Book of Sports on the Lord's day, for the purpose of suppressing afternoon sermons, of obliging the clergy of his diocese to read the king's declaration, and of punishing such as

CHAP.  
XXVII.

refused. He answered, that he had the king's warrant for printing the Book of Sports; that it was not done to discourage afternoon sermons, since recreations were not allowed till after divine service, and that he enjoined the declaration to be read by the king's command.

If all the particulars under this branch had been proved, they were not of a criminal nature, and were unfit to be mentioned on a trial for high treason. The other branch of the third head imputed to the archbishop a design of subverting the protestant religion, by countenancing Arminianism and popery. Here the managers charged him with being the great patron of that part of the clergy which had declared in favour of those errors, and with procuring their advancement in the church, even while they were under the censure of parliament. They averred that the best preferments in the gift of the king, during his ecclesiastical administration, had been bestowed on persons of those opinions; and that he had advised the king to publish a declaration, forbidding the clergy to preach on the five controverted points, by virtue of which the orthodox clergy were silenced, while their adversaries were permitted to deliver their opinions without impediment.

These allegations the archbishop repelled in the following manner: He had not defended any points of Arminianism, though he heartily wished, for the peace of Christendom, that these differences were not pursued with such heat and animosity\*: he certainly had been represented, in a declaration

\* Laud's History of his Life and Troubles, p. 352.

of the house of commons, as a favourer of Arminianism, but without proof. As well as he could remember, he had not advised the advancement of any improper persons to ecclesiastical preferments, but he had preferred many orthodox ministers, confessedly hostile to Arminianism\*: with respect to the declaration, prohibiting the discussion of the five controverted points in the pulpit, it was the king's act, and not his: he thought it a wise measure †, and had endeavoured to carry it into effect with impartiality; punishing its transgressors, whether Calvinists or Arminians.

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

Besides his partiality in the distribution of ecclesiastical preferments, the archbishop was accused of abusing his authority in licensing books. He had prohibited the Genevan Bible with annotations; his chaplains had refused to license the confession of faith of the churches in the palatinate, Fox's Book of Martyrs, Bishop Jewel's Works, and the History of the Gunpowder Treason. Some of the injured authors appeared to support this charge, and among them Featley. As the archbishop had suppressed or mutilated books in refutation of popish errors, so he had licensed others, in which the grossest doctrines of Arminianism and popery were maintained.

\* He alluded to Taylor and Downham, both Calvinists: but this was represented by the managers as a blind to cover the advancement of so many popish and Arminian clergy.

† Laud was not solitary in his opinion. Sir H. Wotton, the author of that sentence, "*Disputandi prurit, ecclesiarum scabies*," wrote a panegyric on Charles I., for the "laudable temper" displayed in this proclamation. Remains of Sir H. Wotton, p. 147.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

The answer of the archbishop was, that the decree of the star chamber for regulating the press was the act of the whole court, and he thought it a necessary and useful regulation. The particulars charged against him, he either satisfactorily explained, or successfully vindicated. The office of licensing books was generally performed by his chaplains, and a master is not criminally responsible for the acts of his servant.

The most serious charge against the archbishop, and which was reserved till the last, was his attempt to reconcile the church of England with the church of Rome. This treasonable design appeared from the papal titles, which he either assumed, or suffered to be bestowed on him; from his forbidding the clergy to pray for the conversion of the queen; from his having been offered a cardinal's hat; from his acknowledgment that the church of Rome was a true church, and his denial that the pope was antichrist; from his attempt to sow discord between the church of England and foreign protestants; from his correspondence and intimacy with the papal nuncio, and other Jesuits and papists; from his promotion of the king's marriage with a popish princess; and from his concealment of a late plot to reduce the three kingdoms to popery and slavery \*."

It is impossible to blame the archbishop for answering these accusations in the following indignant appeal to his judges: "My lords, I have been charged with an endeavour to reconcile the church of England with the church of Rome: I

\* Prynne's *Canterbury's Doom*, p. 539.

shall recite the sum of the evidence, and the arguments to prove it. 1. I have reduced several persons from popery, whom I have already named; therefore I have endeavoured to bring in popery. 2. I have made a canon against popery, and an oath to abjure it; therefore I have endeavoured to introduce it. 3. I have been twice offered a cardinal's hat, and have refused it, because I would not be subject to the pope; therefore I have endeavoured to subject the church of England to him. 4. I wrote a book against popery; therefore I am inclinable to it. 5. I have been in danger of my life from a popish plot; therefore I cherished it, and endeavoured to accomplish it. 6. I endeavoured to reconcile the Lutherans and Calvinists, therefore I laboured to bring in popery \*."

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

This general denial was strengthened by a vindication of himself from the particular articles. Whatever papal titles he had assumed, he had derived them, not from the popes, but from the king. He acknowledged that he had been offered a cardinal's hat, but refused it, because he could not accept it till Rome was otherwise than it then was. He certainly thought that the church of Rome was a true church†, and still believed that she did not

\* Laud's History, pp. 285. 418.

† Neither, in this respect, was Laud singular. "They," meaning the puritans, "promoted the interest of Rome, and betrayed the protestant cause, partly by mistaking the question, a very common fault among them, but especially through the necessity of some false principle. Among those false principles it shall suffice for the present to have named but this one; *that the church of Rome is no true church.*"—Sanderson's Pref. to his Sermons.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

err in fundamentals; for the foundation of the Christian religion is in the articles of the creed, and she denies none of them. She is therefore a true church, though not an orthodox one; our religion and theirs is one in essentials, and salvation may be obtained in either. It had never been proved that he denied the pope to be anti-christ, though many learned men had denied it, neither did the homilies affirm it. He confessed that he had often wished for a reconciliation between the churches of England and Rome in a just and Christian way; but a reconciliation contrary to truth and piety he had never desired \*.

With respect to the foreign protestant churches, so far from sowing discord among them, he had endeavoured to unite them, and he had not absolutely unchurched them †: In his book against Fisher, he had said, what Jerome had said before him, "No bishop, no church;" and that none but a bishop could ordain, except in cases of inevitable necessity; and whether that necessity existed among the foreign churches, the world must judge. He had never invaded the privileges of the French and Dutch churches in this kingdom, but had opposed their recent encroachments: it was not the design of queen Elizabeth to protect them, unless they conformed to the English liturgy.

He also vindicated himself from any intimacy and

\* Laud's History, p. 392.

† If he had, he would have been more consistent than Usher, who admitted the validity of ordination by the foreign protestants, but denied it to the Scottish and Irish presbyterians.



correspondence with papists and Jesuits, knowing them to be such\*, and the papal nuncios he could not prevent from coming. Yet he had never cultivated any intimacy with those accredited agents from Rome, and he had never entertained them at his table. But it is not treason to abstain from persecuting or reviling even the Jesuits.

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

In the affair of the contemplated marriage with a princess of Spain, or of the actual marriage with a princess of France, it could not be proved that he had any concern; for at that time he had no weight in the public councils. He had not concealed the late plot to bring in popery, but had revealed it to the king, as soon as it was communicated to himself.

The trial of Laud occupied the attention of the two houses twenty-one days, in the course of four months. Before the archbishop withdrew from the bar, when his defence was concluded, he moved the lords, that, considering the length of his trial, and the distance of time between the several days of his hearing, they would allow him a day when he might place before the court, at one view, the several articles of impeachment, and his answers. This request was granted, and five weeks were allowed for the execution of the task prescribed.

July 29.

When the archbishop appeared on the appointed

\* Particularly Franciscus de Clara, a Jesuit, whose real name was Christopher Davenport. He published an exposition of the thirty-nine articles, to show that they were not, in the popish sense, heretical; but his work pleased neither the protestants nor papists. Jeremy Taylor, unfortunately for his reputation, cultivated an acquaintance with Davenport; but it could not be said that Laud approved the man or his work.  
—Bishop Heber's *Life of Bishop Taylor*.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

Sept. 2.

day, he began with a pathetic address; expatiating on his sacred station, his age, his long imprisonment, and the sequestration of his estate \*. He then recapitulated the several charges, with his answers; and concluded with a petition that, after the managers of the commons had replied to his defence, counsel might be heard on his behalf as to points of law.

Sept. 11.

The commons having finished their reply, the archbishop's counsel delivered two queries, on which they were prepared to sustain an argument.

1. Whether, in all or any of the articles charged against the archbishop, there be contained any treason, by the established laws of the kingdom?
2. Whether the impeachment and articles did not contain such certainties and particularities as are required by law in cases of treason?

The lords sent down the queries to the commons, who, after having referred them to a committee, agreed that the archbishop's counsel might be heard on the first query, but not on the second.

Oct. 11.

The legal argument on the first query was so ably supported †, that it was abundantly sufficient for the acquittal of the archbishop. After showing that the laws against treason were designed for the security of the subject as to his life, his liberty,

\* It was not till the end of his trial, and after repeated solicitations, that the commons allowed to him 200*l.* to support his necessary expenses.

† The archbishop's counsel were Hern and Hale (afterwards that uncorrupt judge, Sir M. Hale), with Gerrard. Hern delivered the argument; but archbishop Sancroft, in a marginal note on Wharton's *History of the Troubles of Archbishop Laud*, has remarked, that it was previously drawn by Hale.—See Collier's *Eccl. Hist.* vol. ii. b. 9. p. 831.

and property, and that penal statutes ought not to be construed by equity or inference, but with the most literal precision, the counsel summed up in the following words: "Thus have we endeavoured to make it appear, that none of the matters in any of the articles charged are treason within the letter of the law; indeed, the crimes, as they are laid in the charge, are many and great, but their number cannot make them exceed their nature; and if they be but crimes and misdemeanours apart, below treason, they cannot be made treason by putting them together."

A. D.  
1644.  
Charles I.

This argument of the archbishop's counsel had its due weight with the lords; and the reply of the managers was not satisfactory to the court. The judgment, therefore, was deferred, and probably the innocence of the primate would have been established, if the commons had not resolved to proceed by a bill of attainder, and not to press for judgment on the evidence produced at the trial.

When the bill had been read a second time, the archbishop was brought to the bar of the house of commons, to hear the grounds on which it was supported, and to make his defence. He defended himself with great spirit, in a speech which occupied several hours in the delivery; but before an auditory so prejudiced, argument and eloquence were unavailing. The bill of attainder passed the house of commons, with only one dissentient voice. The bill was then sent up to the lords; and, to quicken their tardiness, the enemies of Laud had recourse to their usual expedients. It was daringly suggested, that on this occasion both the lords and commons ought to sit in the same assembly; but

November.

Nov. 11.

Nov. 13.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

this insult aroused the spirit of the house of peers, low as it had now fallen. Regardless of the insolent messages of the commons, and the clamours of the populace, they spent several days in comparing the proofs of the managers with the defence of the archbishop. At length, in a house of fourteen members, the majority pronounced him guilty of certain acts, but left it to the judges to determine whether or not these acts amounted to treason. Their answer was, that nothing of which he had been convicted was treason by the statute law; and the lords informed the commons, that they scrupled to pass the bill of attainder.

**Dec. 25.** On that Christmas day, which was observed as a day of mortification, by an ordinance of the two houses, the crimes of the archbishop offered a tempting theme for the eloquence of the presbyterian preachers. So efficacious was their rhetoric, that on the next morning a committee of the house of commons demanded a conference with the lords.

**Jan. 2.** In this conference the representations of the commons prevailed; but when the bill was resumed many of the lords withdrew. The ordinance of

**Jan. 4.** attainder was passed by the remainder, consisting only of six members\*.

To stop the progress of the bill of attainder, the archbishop produced the king's pardon under the great seal. This instrument had been drawn under the direction of sir Edward Hyde, then with the

\* The peers were lord Grey de Werk, president; the earls of Kent, Pembroke, Salisbury, and Bolingbroke; and the barons North and Bruce. Bruce afterwards denied that he had voted. Clarendon's History of the Rebellion. Laud's Troubles. Rushworth's Collect.

king at Oxford, and with the most anxious attention to every legal formality; but it was overruled by the house of commons, and by the house, if it deserve the name, of peers. Two reasons were assigned for the invalidity of the pardon: first, because it was granted before conviction; and secondly, because, if it had been granted subsequently, the king could not pardon a judgment of the parliament, as the nation was in a state of war\*.

A. D.  
1645.  
Charles I.

It was a melancholy consolation to Charles, that he was innocent of the blood of Laud, and that he had given a last, though unavailing, mark of affection to this faithful servant. It was also a consolation to the dying primate, and was acknowledged by him with heartfelt gratitude.

With Christian tranquillity he now prepared himself for death; and the only favour which he solicited from his enemies, was a commutation of his sentence†. He had employed many hours of his confinement in writing the history of his life and troubles, and not until five days before he suffered, did he discontinue his autobiographical labours. In subordination to his devotional exercises, he employed those five days in the composition of a speech, or rather a sermon, to be delivered at the place of execution. He chose rather to read than to speak his dying declaration, in which choice he showed equal prudence and magnanimity‡.

The virulence which had been displayed during

\* Whitelocke's Memoirs.

† The remarks of bishop Warburton on this passage in Clarendon are in the highest degree unfeeling.

‡ Heylin's Life of Laud.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

the trial of Laud was strongly shown before his execution. A delay of some days having occurred after the sentence was passed, some of the citizens of London closed their shops, "professing not to open them till justice was executed\*." Of the divines, whose consolatory attendance he solicited in his last moments, Stern, one of his chaplains, was alone allowed, and he was under the inspection of two puritan ministers.

Laud rose above these cruel insults, and above the terrors of his execution; and though he had usually professed himself apprehensive of a violent death, his fears were dissipated before that superior courage with which he was animated. Those religious opinions for which he suffered, contributed no doubt to the courage and constancy of his end†. In his address on the scaffold, he acknowledged himself to be a sinner in the sight of God; but protested that he was innocent of the crimes for which he was about to die. "It is clamoured against me," he said, "that I designed to bring in popery; but I pray God that the pope do not come in by means of those sectaries which clamour so much against me." As for the king, he assured the world that there was not a more sound protestant in England. He lamented the ruin of the hierarchy, and declared that he was not an enemy to parliaments.

While he was preparing for the block, his equanimity sustained a trial from the officious and

\* "This malice and madness is scarce credible; but I myself saw it."—Izaak Walton's *Life of Sanderson*.

† Hume's *History of Great Britain*, c. 57.

obtrusive questions of sir John Clotworthy; but having answered them with meekness and discretion, he found it useless to prolong the conference, and bade the executioner perform his office.

A. D.  
1645.  
Charles I.

When this important work had been despatched \*, the two houses of parliament prepared to debate the question, whether a treaty of peace with the king should commence? An overture to that effect had been made by the king in the preceding summer; but the parliament waited for a third message before a reluctant assent was given. At Uxbridge, within the parliamentary quarters, commissioners on both sides met, and it was settled that the negotiation was to continue twenty days from the time of its commencement. The propositions to be debated were three in number; religion, the militia, and Ireland. Each of these propositions was to be argued on three successive days, until the twenty days, allotted for the duration of the treaty, were expired.

Jan. 30.

On the part of the king there were sixteen commissioners, consisting of nine peers, six commoners, and one divine. For the English parliament there were twelve commissioners, besides ten for the Scots, and one divine. The king's divine was Steward, dean of St. Paul's and clerk of the closet, assisted by Sheldon, Laney, Fern, Potter, and Hammond. The parliamentary divine was Alexander Henderson, accompanied by Vines, Marshal, Cheynel, and Chievely. The principals on each side sat covered within the bar, behind the commissioners of their respective parties, and the assistants sat uncovered, near their principals.

\* Clarendon.

---

**CHAP.  
XXVII.**

The treaty was preceded by a day of fasting and prayer on both sides, for the success of the negotiation ; but the solemn exercise was interrupted by the inflammatory sermon of one Love, at this time a preacher in the garrison at Windsor. He came in the train of the parliamentary commissioners, and as a sermon was usually delivered in the town of Uxbridge on every market day, he seized the occasion of prejudicing a numerous auditory against the pending treaty. The king's commissioners, he said, came thither with hearts full of blood, and there was as great a distance between this treaty and peace as between heaven and hell. For this insolent language the preacher received no other castigation than that of being sent out of the town, and of submitting to confinement until the treaty was ended.

Religion was the first point which came under discussion ; and the parliamentary commissioners, instead of treating concerning a reformation of the hierarchy, were instructed to demand the royal assent to their bills, for the abolition of episcopacy, for sanctioning the assembly of divines, for legalizing the Directory, and for imposing the Solemn League and Covenant on the king, and on every subject within the three kingdoms. The instructions given by the king to his commissioners were, not to yield the point of episcopacy, as he had sworn to maintain it by his coronation oath, and he was inclined to preserve the bishops, as well from policy as from conscience\*.

\* Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. v. Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iii. c. 5.



After several papers had passed between the other commissioners, the bill for abolishing episcopacy was debated between the two principal divines. Henderson began with rhetoric rather than logic, and expatiated on the necessity of altering the government of the church, since in no other way could the state be preserved. The question was not, whether both could be preserved? for that was already determined by the parliament to be impossible. Neither was the question, whether episcopacy was lawful, and the government of the church by bishops compatible with Christianity? but, whether it was so necessary, that Christianity could not subsist without it? This last position could not be maintained, without condemning all the reformed churches of Europe. It was, therefore, sufficient that the parliament had decided that episcopacy was an unnecessary, inconvenient, and corrupt institution. The English hierarchy had been a public grievance, and since the time of the reformation the bishops had always abetted popery, and had retained many of its superstitions. They had made gradual advances to the church of Rome, and thereby given offence to the protestant churches in Germany, France, Scotland, and Holland. They had also occasioned the late war between the English and Scots, next the Irish rebellion, and, thirdly, the present civil war. For these reasons, the parliament had resolved to change a form of government so mischievous, and to substitute another, better calculated for the promotion of piety. He trusted, therefore, that the king would concur in so commendable and godly a design, and humbly conceived that the royal con-

A. D.  
1645.

---

Charles I.

science could not be urged against such a compliance, because the king had consented to abolish episcopacy in Scotland ; therefore it was incredible that episcopacy was essential to a Christian church.

The reply of Steward, delivered with a much better countenance, was full and precise. He hoped and knew that the commissioners were too well acquainted with the constitution of the church of England to be shaken by the rhetoric of his opponent. Though he believed it impossible to prove that a form of government settled and continued without interruption, from the time when Christianity was first planted in England, was an unlawful and antichristian government ; yet he expected that they who had sworn to abolish it, and were come thither to persuade others to do the same, would have endeavoured at least to prove its unlawfulness. But though, in their sermons and popular writings, they gave to episcopacy an antichristian addition, yet, on this occasion, they had prudently declined that argument, and had only attempted to show the inconvenience of the institution. Since an union with the foreign protestant churches was the chief reason for the proposed alteration, he desired to know which of the foreign churches it was intended to adopt as a model for England. The new Directory had no resemblance to the worship of any foreign church. Though he would not take upon himself to censure other communions, yet it was sufficiently known, that the most learned men of those churches had lamented the want of episcopacy among themselves, and had always shown a particular reverence towards the English church, because she had retained

all that was innocent or venerable in antiquity. He then enlarged on the original institution of episcopacy, and endeavoured to prove that without it the priestly order could not be conferred. As to the abolition of episcopacy in Scotland, he knew the king's sentiments on that subject, though he would not presume to express them. But he observed, that in England the king was under a specific obligation to maintain the bishops and clergy in their rights, privileges, and possessions.

A. D.  
1645.  
Charles I.

At the first meeting, Steward and Henderson only were permitted to dispute; but at the second, the assistant divines were called in, and a disputation occurred between Hammond and Vines\*. The marquis of Hertford attempted to moderate the disputes, by calling the disputants from an interminable discussion on the divine right of episcopacy, to the propositions of the parliament.

The disputation, on the motion of Steward, was then carried on syllogistically, and in this mode of argumentation two days were consumed; but at the end of the three days allotted for the discussion of religion, the chancellor of Scotland began a violent invective against the order of bishops, accusing them of causing the late troubles in Scotland, and the existing calamities in England. He recalled the imprudent conduct of the late archbishop of Canterbury, who had prosecuted with so much violence the introduction of a liturgy and canons into the Scottish kirk. He lamented and complained that three days had been already spent

\* Fell's Life of Dr. Hammond.

CHAP. in a fruitless altercation, and that the king's  
XXVII. commissioners had conceded no point of importance.

“The divine eloquence of the chancellor of Scotland,” was answered by sir Edward Hyde, who said, that he was not surprised that those who had been educated in a different faith and worship from the English church should be unwilling to depart from it without due deliberation. The wars and dissensions to which the chancellor had alluded, were to be imputed, in his opinion, to a vehement desire of subverting episcopacy, and not to the intemperance of the friends of that institution. If the archbishop of Canterbury had been too precipitate, he had paid dearly for his indiscretion. He concluded by saying, that they were come there with an earnest desire for peace; but if this desire were frustrated, he should impute no dishonourable motives to either party\*.

When the debates concerning religion were renewed, the king's commissioners delivered a written answer to the parliamentary propositions, and the reasons of their dissent. They were willing to agree to some concessions, which they specified; but these were treated by the other side as so many new propositions, and, after an angry debate, were rejected. The concessions of the king might have been accepted, had they been made before the coalition with the Scots; but, by the Solemn League and Covenant, the parliament was pledged to extirpate episcopacy, and, to agree to any modified

\* Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. v.

form of episcopal government, would now be a violation of an international engagement.

A. D.  
1645.

Charles I.

It is probable that neither party was sincere in its wishes for an adjustment of the differences. The king had been elevated by a romantic letter from Montrose, announcing the conquest of Scotland, and the parliament only waited the rupture of the negotiation to model the army, and to renew the war on an enlarged scale. The old regiments were disbanded, and newly enlisted under commanders who were resolved either to conquer or die. The privates were of that class of religionists denominated independents, and the former presbyterian chaplains having gained possession of the richest benefices, left the army to the care of self-appointed instructors\*.

The effects of this change were soon perceived, and the total discomfiture of the king's cause was the result. Fortune seemed to smile on Charles at the siege of Leicester; but the battle of Naseby, however capable of being retrieved by prudence, left to an inconstant prince, already at the mercy of contending factions, no alternative than flight or submission.

June 14.

Irresolution and obstinacy, two qualities apparently contradictory, were blended in the character of Charles. One maxim he had laid down for the regulation of his conduct, which he inflexibly pursued; but, though fixed as to his object, he was

\* "It was the ministers that lost all, by forsaking the army, and betaking themselves to an easy way of life. When the earl of Essex first went out, each regiment had an able chaplain; but after Edgehill fight, most of them went home, and left the army to their own conduct."—Baxter's Life and Times.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

wavering as to the means best calculated to attain it. It was his avowed policy to take advantage of the growing dissensions among his enemies, and to unite himself to that party which would offer the fairest terms; but he was undecided which of the two great factions he should favour, and by his vacillation lost the confidence of both\*.

The English nation was now clearly divided into two religious factions, the presbyterians and the independents. A considerable majority in the English parliament were still of the first class; but the whole English army, with a few exceptions, not sufficient to change its complexion, were of the last. But the presbyterians had the support of the Scottish parliament, and, which was more important, of a Scottish army, at this time stationed in England.

The English parliament was still disposed to an accommodation, provided the king would consent to abolish episcopacy, and would offer sufficient assurances to govern in future according to law. Yet, though such was their profession, their conduct disproved its sincerity; for, as the fortunes of Charles compelled him to recede, they were enabled to advance in their demands. Several messages were sent by Charles, requiring a personal treaty at London, and safety and honour while the treaty was pending; but the parliament refused to trust the king and his adherents within the metropolis. The two houses were employed in preparing bills,

\* "I am not without hope that I shall be able to draw either the presbyterians or independents to side with me, for extirpating the one or the other; that I shall be really king again."  
—Carte's Ormond, vol. iii.

to which they intended to make the royal assent the preliminary of a permanent settlement.

A. D.  
1645.

Thus the winter was consumed, while the king passed his anxious hours at Oxford, forsaken by his best friends, and rudely treated by his few discontented followers. The neglect and the insults which he experienced rendered it a difficult because an equal choice, whether he would be the captive of his victorious enemies, or the slave of his own vanquished party. The noble historian draws a veil over this part of the scene, frankly acknowledging that it is impossible to describe it with proper clearness, unless by opening a door to such reflections on the king himself, as seem to call both his wisdom and his steadiness in question\*.

Charles I.  
1646.

Destitute of resources at home, deprived of all aid from the queen abroad, he could not take the field in the ensuing spring. His remaining garrisons became an easy conquest to the parliamentary army; and the resolution of Fairfax to lay siege to Oxford forced on his mind the afflictive consideration, that he must seek another asylum, or make an unconditional surrender of his person.

In his own unbiassed judgment, Charles preferred the independents, who asked only a religious toleration, while the presbyterians held that toleration was no better than soul-murder. But the counsels of the queen predominated: she was of opinion that the independents sought to deceive him to his ruin, and that he should rather join the presbyterians, by consenting to the abolition of episcopacy.

\* Clarendon.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

April 27.

But a negotiation with the independents was carrying on, even to the time when Charles was compelled to leave Oxford; and it has been said that, when he quitted it, he was irresolute as to his destination. Disguised as a servant, in the company of Hudson his chaplain, and Ashburnham, one of his confidential couriers, he pursued the road to London, and at one time entertained thoughts of entering the city, and throwing himself on the mercy of the parliament. But, at last, after passing through many cross-roads, he arrived at the Scottish camp before Newark. The parliament, hearing of his escape from Oxford, issued rigorous orders, and threatened with instant death whoever should harbour or conceal him\*.

May 5.

On what terms the king surrendered his person to the Scottish army, whether without condition, or whether with previous stipulations for his safety, his honour, or, what he most valued, his religion, are questions which have been differently answered. The king himself asserted, that he had good assurances for the safety of his own person, and of his adherents, as to their honour and consciences. On the contrary, the Scottish commissioners, in their communication of the event to the house of peers, averred that no agreement, either public or private, was made.

The king being now in the hands of the Scots, the English presbyterians resumed their courage, concluding that they could not fail of bringing the parliament to their own terms of uniformity. For this purpose, having framed a remonstrance in the

\* Whitelocke's Memoirs.



name of the lord mayor, aldermen, and common council, they presented it to the house of commons. It complained, that the golden reins of discipline were let loose; that particular congregations were permitted to adopt whatever form of divine service they pleased; and that sectaries began to swarm by virtue of a toleration granted to tender consciences. The house was reminded of the covenant, which was an obligation to extirpate not only popery, prelacy, and superstition, but also heresy, schism, profaneness, and whatever else was contrary to the form of sound doctrine; and, above all, to defend the person and authority of the king. It was therefore prayed, that all separate congregations might be suppressed; that no person disaffected to the presbyterian government might be employed in any place of public trust; that all jealousies between the English and Scots might be removed; and that both nations would unite in propositions to the king for a safe and well-grounded peace.

A. D.  
1646.

Charles I.

This remonstrance was supported by the whole Scottish army. A letter of congratulation was also sent from the general assembly of the kirk of Scotland to the corporation of London, commending its zeal and courage against sectaries, its firm adherence to the covenant, and to the divine authority of presbytery. The English brethren were exhorted to go on boldly in the work which they had begun, till the three kingdoms were united in one faith and worship.

June 10.

Alarmed at this undisguised display of the domineering spirit of presbyterianism, the independents and sectarians in the army procured a counter-

CHAP.  
XXVII.

petition from the city, applauding the labours and success of the parliament in the cause of liberty, and praying that the two houses would persevere, and not suffer the freeborn people of England to be enslaved under any pretence whatsoever.

The parliament was embarrassed between the two parties, one contending for uniformity, and the other for liberty; and, without offending either, the two houses endeavoured to avoid a decision, at least until they saw the result of their negotiations with the king. To their captive monarch, however, they joined with the Scots in proposing the Solemn League and Covenant as the basis of a pacification.

The king having been removed from Newark, where he first surrendered himself, to Newcastle, continued there eight months; and during this period was employed in a political negotiation, and in a theological controversy. When he was first pressed on the two points, so strenuously urged by the English and Scotch presbyterians, the covenant, and the presbyterian form of church government, he pleaded conscience. However he might have yielded to the Scots the enjoyment of their own ecclesiastical discipline, yet in England the established form of church government, since the reformation, was that of episcopacy; and he had engaged to maintain it at his coronation. Yet, to show that he was not afraid to defend his opinions, or ashamed to change them if erroneous, he was willing to enter into a conference with any person selected by the presbyterians on these points: 1. That the episcopacy for which he contended was

not of divine institution; 2. That his coronation oath did not bind him to support and defend the episcopal church of England.

A. D.  
1646.

Charles I.

To satisfy the king's scruples on these points, Alexander Henderson was summoned from Edinburgh to Newcastle. Already had this celebrated presbyterian minister entered the lists of disputation with the episcopalian divines at Uxbridge, and he was now to engage in a controversy with the king himself. He was generally reputed to possess not only learning and eloquence, but, which were rare qualities in a Scottish presbyterian, moderation and discretion.

The debate was carried on in writing, and the papers have been justly thought worthy of preservation. The disingenuous and distrustful spirit of modern sectarians and republicans has not impugned their authenticity, and impartial criticism has awarded the superiority, both in style and argument, to the king. One part of the argument should not be suppressed, as it shows the different temper of the episcopalians and the presbyterians. The king having declared, that no one thing gave him a greater reverence for the church of England than that its reformation was conducted after the manner of the apostles, "neither with multitude nor tumult;" Henderson, in opposition to the apostolical practice, cites, without disapprobation, though he calls it "a hard saying," a maxim of Grosted, bishop of Lincoln, that reformation was not to be expected, *NISI IN ORE GLADII CRUENTANDI*\*.

\* King Charles's Works, folio.

CHAP.  
XXVII.

To disengage the king from his coronation oath, as far as it related to the church, Henderson observed, that when an oath has a special regard to the benefit of those to whom the engagement is made, if the parties interested relax upon the point, and dispense with the advantage, the obligation is at an end. Thus, if the two houses of parliament agree to repeal a law, the king may conscientiously assent, notwithstanding his personal oath. The king, while he admitted Henderson's principle, denied its application. For if it be inquired for whose benefit the clause in the coronation oath was made, the answer must be, it was made to the church of England. Thus it is not in the power of the two houses of parliament to discharge the obligation of the oath. It is only the church of England, for whose benefit he took it, which can release him from it; and, therefore, when the church of England, lawfully assembled, shall declare him discharged, then, and not till then, shall he reckon himself at liberty\*.

On the termination of the conference, Henderson retired to Edinburgh, and within six weeks after his return, died. The episcopalians and royalists have ascribed his death to his defeat †; while the presbyterians have found a sufficient cause for his death, not in mortification at his own inferiority, but in grief at the king's impenetrability to conviction ‡.

To confer a more signal triumph on the king, a

\* King Charles's Works, folio.

† Lord Clarendon, Bishop Kennet, Echard, Heylin.

‡ Whitelocke, Ludlow, Neal, Burnet.

recantation, purporting to be made by Henderson on his death-bed, was given to the world\*. It has been generally considered spurious, and, after a full investigation, was formally disowned by the general assembly of the Scottish kirk. By that body the document was pronounced to be a forgery, scandalous and false, and its author and contriver to be void of charity and a good conscience, a gross liar and a calumniator, and led by the spirit of the accuser of the brethren. The episcopalian and royalist, while he hesitates to subscribe the anathema of the general assembly, will not be solicitous to establish the genuineness of the document, since it confers more honour on the dubious candour of Henderson, than on the acknowledged abilities of Charles.

A. D.  
1646.

Charles I.  
August 7.  
1648.

\* It is too long for insertion in a note; but it may be found in the Histories of Echard and Kennet. One argument for its spuriousness is, that Henderson was a Scotchman, whereas the style of the recantation is "elegantly English."

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

Propositions of the two Parliaments offered to the King at Newcastle, and rejected.—King delivered by the Scots to the English Parliament, and removed to Holdenby House.—Visitation of the University of Oxford.—Preachers sent to prepare the Way for the Visitation.—Enmities of Chillingworth and Cheynel.—Judgment of the University of Oxford against the Solemn League and Covenant, the Negative Oath, and the Directory.—Visitation of Oxford, and Ejectment of the Royalists.—King seized by the Army, and removed to Hampton Court.—Flies to the Isle of Wight.—Treaty of Newport.—A self-constituted High Court of Justice sits for the Trial of the King.—Conduct of the different religious Classes.—The King beheaded—ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.  
Feb. 23.

WHILE the king was engaged in defending episcopacy with his pen, the English parliament was employed in preparing its propositions of peace. The Scottish commissioners demurred to them for some time, but having at length yielded, a deputation from the two houses joined with the Scots in opening a negotiation at Newcastle\*. The articles relating to religion were, that the king, after the example of his father, should take the Solemn League and Covenant; that episcopacy, and all its appendages, should be abolished; that

\* The English peers were the earls of Pembroke and Suffolk; the commoners were sir Walter Erle, sir John Hippesley, Robert Goodwin, and Luke Robertson: the earls of Argyle, and Loudon, the chancellor, were the Scottish commissioners. Marshal was the chaplain of the deputation. Rushworth's Collections, vol. vi.

the ordinance for calling the assembly of divines should be confirmed; that, since both kingdoms were obliged, by the covenant, to establish an uniformity of faith and worship in both kingdoms, such a reformation should be made as their respective parliaments, aided by their divines, might determine; that an oath, containing an abjuration of the papal supremacy, should be tendered to all Romanists, and, on their refusal to take it, they should be subjected to all the penalties of recusancy; that their children should be educated in the protestant religion; and, lastly, that bills should be passed for the better observance of the Lord's day, for the suppression of pluralities, and for the reformation of the two universities.

A. D.  
1646.  
Charles I.

The powers of the commissioners extended no farther than to receive the king's answer to the propositions, and to obviate his scruples. The earl of Pembroke plainly told the king that the commissioners must either receive his final resolutions within ten days, or return; and both intercessions and menaces were used to procure his assent. It has been said, that the English deputies besought him, on their knees, to comply; but the earl of Loudon advanced far beyond the language of expostulation, and spake to this effect: "The differences between your majesty and your parliament are grown to such a height, that, after many bloody battles, they have your majesty, with all your garrisons and strong towns, in their hands. They are now in a capacity to do what they will in church and state; and some are so afraid, and others so unwilling, to submit to your government, that they desire not you, nor any of your race, to reign longer

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

over them; but they are unwilling to proceed to extremities, till they hear your last resolutions. Now, sir, if you shall refuse to assent to the propositions, you will lose all your friends in the houses and in the city, and all England will join against you as one man: you will be deposed, and the nation will set up another government. The people of England will charge us to deliver you to them, and remove our armies within our own borders; and, upon your refusal, we shall be constrained to settle religion and peace without you. We own that the propositions are higher in some things than we approve; but the only way to establish your throne is to consent to them at present, and you may recover in a time of peace all that you have lost in this time of tempest and trouble\*.”

Through sir William Davenant, the queen added her solicitations, and implored the king to give up the church for his own safety: but all powerful as her advice generally was, it was now offered in vain. Davenant himself presumed to offer some arguments of his own; and having mentioned the church slightly, the king abruptly dismissed him, and commanded him never again to appear in the presence of his sovereign†.

When the time limited for receiving the king's answer had expired, he gave it in writing to the commissioners, but addressed it to the speaker of the house of peers. He said that he knew not what answer to make, till he should be satisfied whether any authority would be left to the monarch, if the

\* Rushworth's Collect. vol. vi.

† Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, b. 3.



concessions now demanded were made. His counter proposal was, to come to either of his own palaces in the neighbourhood of London, and there reside, till, in a personal treaty with his parliament, such an agreement might be established as might be permanent. But he was convinced that the happiness of the kingdom would never be promoted by the propositions now submitted to him\*.

A. D.  
1646.  
Charles I.

In his interviews with the commissioners, Charles endeavoured to convince them of the expediency of tolerating episcopacy, even for their own object, that of destroying the sectaries. He demanded liberty of conscience for himself and for those of his own persuasion : he was contented to restrain episcopal government to the diocesses of Oxford, Winchester, Bath and Wells, and Exeter, leaving the rest of England to the presbyterian discipline, with the strictest clauses which could be penned against the papists and independents. But the Scots would abate nothing of the rigour of the covenant, even to accomplish the overthrow of popery and sectarianism †.

When the king failed in his attempts to convince the Scottish commissioners, he made an application, through his friends, to the kirk. His proposals were laid before the general assembly; but that body was equally inflexible with the commissioners. It was there resolved, that the king's heart was not with the kirk of Scotland, and that his promises could not be depended on, any longer

\* Clarendon's History, b. 10.

† Duke of Hamilton's Memoirs, p. 288.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

than it was not in his power to set them aside. Charles would have willingly retired into Scotland, but its clergy refused to admit him. The general assembly published a solemn warning to all estates and degrees of persons throughout Scotland, that, by receiving the king, the suspicions of the English nation would be excited. So far as their sovereign was for the Solemn League and Covenant, so far they would be for him; but if he refused to satisfy the desires of his people, both kingdoms were engaged to pursue the ends of the covenant against all lets and impediments. On reading the admonitions of the kirk, the Scottish parliament resolved, that the king be desired to grant the whole of the propositions, and that, in case of his denial, the kingdom should be settled without him. It was further resolved, that the kingdom of Scotland could not lawfully engage for the king, as long as he refused to take the covenant, and give the required satisfaction in point of religion \*.

1647.  
January.

After some delay, these resolutions of the Scottish parliament were delivered to the king: but he was steady in his denial of their demands. His determination having been reported, it was debated in the Scottish parliament, whether the king should be left in England, and to his parliament of that kingdom? The question was decided in the affirmative; and on condition of receiving from England the arrears of pay due to the Scottish army, it was agreed that the army should be withdrawn from the English border, and that the person of the

Jan. 16.

\* Rushworth's Collect. vol. 6.

king should be delivered to the English parliament, under the stipulation that he should be secured from injury or violence.

A. D.  
1647.

Charles I.

While the parliament and kirk of Scotland were debating concerning the disposal of the king, the unhappy prince wrote to the English parliament in the most earnest terms, for a personal treaty. "It is your king," he wrote, "that desires to be heard; the which, if refused to a subject by a king, he would be thought a tyrant: wherefore I conjure you, as you would show yourselves, what you profess, good Christians and good subjects, to accept the offer." But the English parliament, deaf to all proposals, concluded a treaty with the parliament of Scotland. By mutual compact it was settled, that the Scots should be paid the arrears due to their army; that the king should be delivered to such persons as the English parliament might appoint; that his residence should be at Holdenby House, in Northamptonshire, where he should be safe from personal violence; and that, when the Scottish army was removed out of England, both parliaments should unite in persuading the king to consent to the propositions.

The sum of two hundred thousand pounds, being half of the arrears due to the Scottish army, was paid, according to the agreement, before the king was delivered; and, on this account, it has been commonly said, that the Scots basely sold their native prince. It is incumbent on those who resent the charge as false and injurious, to answer the following questions: 1. Would the English have paid the arrears, without the person of the king?

Feb. 6.

CHAP. XXVIII. 2. Would the Scots have given up the king, if they could have otherwise received the arrears\*?

The king was treated at Holdenby House with the same formality and cold respect as he had experienced from the Scottish army. Servants were appointed by the parliament to attend him, and he was suffered to enjoy his usual recreations under the superintendence of a guard. The circumstance which chiefly imbibited his residence at Holdenby was the refusal of his chaplains: he wrote a letter to the house of peers, enclosing a list of thirteen divines, and requesting that any two of them might be permitted to give their attendance. The request was refused, and the parliament appointed two presbyterian ministers to perform divine offices to the king's household. The king himself declined attendance on their public ministrations, and though they waited at his table, would not permit them to ask a blessing †.

1646.  
October 9,  
and  
Nov. 16.

Before he king had left Newcastle, the two houses had completed the subversion of the English hierarchy by two ordinances: the one, abolishing the names and titles of archbishops, bishops, and all subordinate gradations; the other, alienating the revenues of these dignities, and applying them to the payment of the public debts. The presbyterians were now at the height of their power; episcopacy was abolished, the king was their prisoner, and the richest benefices were possessed by their ministers.

\* Bishop Warburton's Remarks on Neal's History.

† Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, b. 10. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. c. 7.

But the university of Oxford still remained, the strong hold of episcopacy and loyalty. By the king's command, the garrison had surrendered, and a parliamentary force was stationed in the city; yet the university, unawed by military power, unshaken by the destitute condition of the royalists, was not to be seduced or intimidated. While the university of Oxford remained, the church of England was not overthrown.

A. D.  
1647.  
Charles I.  
June 24.

When Laud was first committed to the Tower, he resigned the chancellorship of Oxford, and in a pathetic epistle lamented the hard necessity of relinquishing a situation which he had fondly hoped to retain to the end of his days. He earnestly recommended the university to elect a successor who was able to protect its interests; and its choice fell on the earl of Pembroke. Soon was it discovered that the new chancellor had betrayed its privileges; and, being dismissed from his honourable office, the marquis of Hertford was elected in his room.

It could not be expected that, after the surrender of the garrison, the parliament would contentedly leave the university in its ancient state. An article of the capitulation had provided, that all the academical rights and privileges should be preserved; but a clause in the article also provided, that the reservation of the privileges of the university should not preclude any reformation intended by parliament.

By virtue of this clause, and to prepare the way for the intended reformation, the parliament deputed seven of their most popular preachers to announce the projected visitation, to soften the prejudices of the academics, and to reconcile the uni-

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

versity to parliamentary domination. One of these has become the object of curiosity, not on account of his own merits, but because his memory is connected with that of an illustrious name. Cheynel would have been consigned to oblivion, had he not been the pertinacious enemy of Chillingworth.

Of Chillingworth, "the miracle of his age for reasoning," the boast of the university of Oxford, who would not indulge the remembrance? Not for his skill in disputation\* is he now so much remembered, as for his great, his noble maxim: "THE BIBLE, THE BIBLE ONLY, IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS." This splendid sentence is still the watchword of every member of the church of England; and it is exhibited on his phylactery, because it is engraven on his heart.

Let it not be thought irrelevant, for it cannot be uninteresting, to insert an historical episode on the enmities of Chillingworth and Cheynel. Had Cheynel been equal to his adversary in acuteness and learning, it had not been easy to have found for either a more proper opposite; for they were both, to the last degree, zealous, active, and pertinacious†, and their biography affords, by contrast in some instances, and by similarity in others, a mutual illustration of their characters.

Both were natives of Oxford, and each, from his infancy, was connected with the respective leader of the Calvinistic and Arminian parties in

\* It used to be said in the university, that if the Great Turk, or devil, were to be converted, Chillingworth and lord Falkland were able to do it. Fuller's Worthies. Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy.

† Dr. Johnson's Life of Cheynel.

that university. Laud was the godfather of Chillingworth, and Robert Abbot was the father-in-law of Cheynel. From his youth to his death, Cheynel was the uncompromising advocate of doctrinal Calvinism; while Chillingworth, in early life, was seduced by those Jesuitical sophisms, the fallacy of which, on his return to the protestant faith, he triumphantly exposed. When the whole nation was engaged in a controversy on the rights of the church, and the origin of episcopacy, they embraced opposite sides. When hostilities commenced, both appear to have maintained the principle, that great and noble spirits abhor neutrality, and both added to the praise of learning, the praise of personal valour. Chillingworth turned his mathematical knowledge to the purposes of military tactics, and defended Arundel castle against the parliamentarians; Cheynel acquired so much skill in the science of war, that his commands were obeyed with as much respect as those of any general. In the fortunes of war, Chillingworth was unsuccessful; and Cheynel, belonging to the victorious party, had a power over the person of that man whose opinions he had ever regarded with detestation. His treatment of his ancient and now fallen foe was marked, not by cruelty so much as by eccentricity. Cheynel wished to preserve the life of Chillingworth, in order to convert him from his heresies; and when death left no other act of kindness to be performed, procured for him the rites of Christian sepulture.

When the parliamentarians had gained possession of Oxford, Cheynel, with six associates, repaired to his native university. They were autho-

A. D.  
1647.

Charles I.

1644.  
Jan. 20.  
obit.

1646.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

rized to preach in any of the churches, without regard to the academical right or duty of preaching. They faithfully executed their commission, but they were heard with little veneration; and as they had invaded the pulpit of St. Mary's church, the graver part of the university resorted to the parish church of Saint Mary Magdalen.

Not contented with their exertions in the pulpit, these parliamentary preachers instituted a weekly conference, for resolving cases of conscience, and for answering objections against the new confession of faith, and the new discipline. In these conferences the question or case was propounded on the week previously to the debate, and a moderator was appointed, to keep order, and to begin and end the debate by prayer \*.

These meetings were not only ridiculed by the students †, but they were interrupted by one Erbury, a turbulent antinomian, and a chaplain in the garrison. Being present at one of these conferences, when the subject of debate was the office and dignity of the ministry, he told the presbyterian preachers plainly, that they had no ministry, and were not a church. A day was therefore appointed for the discussion of this important question, "Whether those, who claim the ministerial office, have a greater power, or a larger right to preach the gospel, than any individual of the Christian multitude ‡?" The result of the debate was, that

\* Minister's account, from Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. c. 9.

† The house where the meetings were held was in Saint Peter's in the East, and was called the *Scruple Shop*.

‡ An illi, qui pro ministris se vendicant, majori potestate



the presbyterians were silenced by the same question with which Christ silenced the unbelieving Jews. Having demanded of them, whence they received their ministerial orders? they dared not to answer from the bishops, whom both independents and presbyterians confessed to be antichristian; and they dared not to deny the fact, for then they would be convicted of a notorious falsehood. They were therefore unable to reply, and a shout of triumph was raised in favour of Erbury, to the no small discomfiture of the presbyterian disputants.

A. D.  
1647.  
Charles I.

These checks and interruptions were not compensated by the large congregations to which the parliamentary preachers declaimed, and by their success in persuading some of their hearers, "to renounce the allegiance and the oaths which they had taken to the king; to exercise public fastings and repentance, for having taken up arms in his defence; and to take the Solemn League and Covenant." When the preachers returned to their employers, they reported, that the citizens had showed great respect to their instructions, although the academics had treated them with all imaginable contempt, so that they apprehended themselves to have the same lot with Saint Paul; "some mocked, others slighted them, but others clave unto them and believed."

There being no prospect of reforming the university by the eloquence or the foolishness of preaching, the two houses resolved to proceed to a visitation. An ordinance was passed, nominating several gentlemen, lawyers, and divines, for that

*gaudeant, aut uberiori utantur jure, in annunciendo evangelio, quam quilibet ex plebe Christiano?*—Wood's Athen. Oxon.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

service, empowering these visitors, or any five of them, to hear and determine all crimes, offences, abuses, and disorders, which, by the laws and statutes of the realm, or by the statutes of the university, might be lawfully heard and determined. They were directed to inquire more particularly concerning such as had refused to take the Solemn League and Covenant, and the Negative Oath, and who declined to use the Directory. They were to inquire concerning such as had taken up arms against the parliament, or indirectly assisted the king. They were further authorized to consider and examine all such oaths as were enjoined by the statutes of any particular college, but which were inconvenient or unlawful. An appeal was allowed to any person who thought himself aggrieved by the decision of the visitors, to a committee of the two houses.

Armed with these powers, the visitors applied themselves to the reformation of the university. Soon after the ordinance was passed, a citation was issued by the visitors, summoning the chief officers of the university to appear on an appointed day; but before that day arrived, a mutiny in the garrison of Oxford had almost compelled the postponement of the visitation.

In the mean time, the university, after the first alarm caused by the citation had subsided, made due preparation for the threatened attack. Fell, the dean of Christ-church, at this time vice chancellor, summoned a convocation, in which was passed by unanimous consent\*, “THE JUDGMENT

\* There was one Godfrey of Christ-church, lately come

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, AGAINST THE SOLEMN LEAGUE AND COVENANT, THE NEGATIVE OATH, AND THE DIRECTORY." This declaration was the composition of Sanderson, then professor of divinity; assisted in the theological part by Hammond, Sheldon, and Morley; and in the legal part by Zouch, the king's professor of law. It was at first written in English, but it afterwards was rendered into a Latin version, that the foreign reformed churches might receive an authoritative exposition of the sense of the English church on the most important points of her doctrine and discipline. The strongest proof of the merit of this performance, and which justifies the high encomia pronounced on it, is, that no individual of the presbyterians or independents, not even the assembly of divines at Westminster, ventured to meet it by an answer. It would indeed be an insult on the one, or a sarcasm on the other, to institute a comparison between the convocation of Oxford, and the assembly at Westminster.

A. D.  
1647.  
Charles I.  
June 1.

Although the mutiny of the garrison had detained many of the visitors in London, yet there was a sufficient number to begin the visitation on the appointed day, five being the number prescribed by the ordinance for the transaction of business. The governors of the university were cited to appear, between the hours of nine and eleven, while the visitors opened their proceedings with a sermon. The preacher detained his auditory so long, that they could not quit Saint Mary's church till the clock had struck eleven. As soon as the clock had from Geneva, who dared to breathe a murmur of dissent.

—Wood's Athen. Oxon.

June 4.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

struck, Fell, the vice chancellor, entered the convocation house, and there, by the mouth of the proctor, declared that, the time being elapsed, they were not obliged to a longer attendance. Having procured an attestation of this fact by a public notary, he dismissed the assembly, and left the convocation house, preceded by the beadles. The visitors met him on his return at the proscholium, where, the passage being narrow, one of the beadles cried out, "Make way for the vice chancellor!" The vice chancellor, civilly moving his cap as he passed them, said, "It is past eleven o'clock, gentlemen," and went on, without further notice, while the scholars who followed him could not restrain a burst of applause. The visitors, abashed at the firmness of the chief magistrate, went forward to the convocation house, which the university had vacated, and, after a long deliberation, found it necessary to adjourn, to leave Oxford, and to obtain further powers from the parliament\*.

June 5:

On the day after the defeat of this attempt, a committee of the university passed the following resolutions: that no one should obey any citation from the visitors, unless it were subscribed by five names; that no one should appear on a holyday; that, on his appearance, he should demand by what authority he was summoned, and, if refused an answer, should immediately depart; that, if the authority were stated, he should still answer, with a reservation of the rights of the king and of the university; that he should demand his accusation in writing, and return an answer in the same form;

\* Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy.

and that he should utterly refuse an answer on oath, because to answer in such a manner would be self crimination\*.

A. D.  
1647.  
Charles I.

The two houses being resolved to support their own visitors, passed an ordinance conferring on them additional powers. A new commission was drawn by the attorney general, Saint John, with the great seal affixed. The instrument was in the name of the king, an assumption which served no other purpose than that of giving the enemies of the parliament an opportunity and occasion of charging them with acting under a forged authority†.

Under this commission, the visitors returned to Oxford; the mayor, sheriffs, and other magistrates, being commanded to render their assistance. Sir Nathaniel Brent, one of the visitors, and a notorious enemy of episcopacy, though formerly vicar general to the archbishop of Canterbury, had been appointed warden of Merton College, and the governors of the other colleges were ordered to bring their statutes and registers to his lodgings. The vice chancellor and proctors were commanded to appear at the same time, and to bring the public records, and insignia of their offices. But it is not enough to say, that each of these orders was disobeyed; they were both treated with contempt. The vice chancellor and heads of houses condescended to appear at the second summons, when, instead of bringing their books, they demanded by what authority they were summoned? The visitors, having produced their commission under the broad seal, served the university officers under a

October.

\* Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. c. 9.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

fresh citation. Wightwick, the master of Pembroke College, delivered a written answer to this effect: that he had seen and considered the commission of the visitors under the broad seal; but, having some scruples about the genuineness of the seal, he desired liberty to ascertain the truth of that matter; because, if the commission had been issued in the name only, and not with the consent, of the king, he could not conscientiously submit to its authority. This spirited conduct procured the honour which he sought: he was the first governor of a college ejected by the visitors\*. The proctors, in the name of the university, delivered a protestation, attested by a public notary, that they could not without perjury acknowledge any other visitor than the king, and consequently could not submit to the present visitation. They further desired, that the two houses might be informed of their determination.

To a committee of the houses, instituted for the reformation of the university, the contumacious conduct of its governors was referred. The several functionaries were summoned to London, and, on their appearance in the Painted Chamber before the committee, acknowledged their approbation of the protestation of the proctors. They also delivered a written declaration, stating, that their conduct was dictated, not by obstinacy, but by conscience; and praying that, in an affair of such importance, both to themselves and to the interests of the university, they might be allowed time, and the assistance of counsel.

The request was immediately granted, at the sug-

\* Wood's Antiq. Oxon.

gestion, it is said, of Prynne; and it was granted, not from favour to the petitioners, but because Prynne had assured the committee, "that no man alive could ever prove the king to be visitor of the university." Among his multifarious writings, this lawyer had written a tract, in which he had maintained a contrary position, and he was not unwilling to support his own inconclusive arguments by the vote of a committee of the commons. Thus, while the assistance and private advice of counsel was readily granted, the liberty of retaining counsel publicly to plead in behalf of the university was reluctantly yielded, at the irresistible intercession of Selden.

A. D.  
1647.  
Charles I.  
November.

Four delegates were appointed by the university to conduct their cause; two of whom were, Morley, a canon of Christ-church, and Langbaine, the provost of Queen's College. On the day appointed for the hearing, Morley spoke with a strength of argument, and impressiveness of manner, which gave effect to the interposition of Selden. He complained, that the university deputies were unprepared, and that no counsel would plead their cause, unless authorized by the committee. Bradshaw, one of the counsel for the visitors, attempted at once to go into the merits of the case; but Selden again interposed; and it was resolved, by a majority of two, that Hale and Chute, who had formerly pleaded in behalf of the bishops, should sustain the cause of the university.

A week was allowed for preparation; and a defence of the privileges of the university, equally learned and eloquent, was met by an inefficient reply from the counsel of the visitors, but by a de-

Dec. 9.

**CHAP. XXVIII.** cisive vote of the committee. It was resolved, that  
 “the defence of the several heads of houses, and of others of the university, was derogatory to the authority of the parliament.”

The governors of the university were now convinced that they must be ultimately driven from their strong holds; but they resolved to dispute every inch of ground with their assailants. While the appeal was pending, it was decreed in convocation, that if any one should be summoned hereafter, he should demand, whether the visitors had any other commission than that which had been already produced, and if they had, he should desire to peruse it. In this interval, the wardenship of New College being vacant \*, the fellows, without taking notice of the prohibition of the visitors, proceeded to elect a successor †. The several professors of the faculties still continued to read their lectures, and Sanderson undauntedly read his famous prælection on that abused maxim, *SALUS POPULI SUPREMA LEX*, when his school was filled with presbyterian ministers and independent soldiers.

1468.  
January.

It was now found impossible to reduce the university into subjection, without re-instating the earl of Pembroke into the chancellorship, and sending him to exercise his office in person. Yet, when the visitors, with the new chancellor at their head, had gained possession of the outworks, the same vigour was shown in defending the citadel. The academic youth were animated with the same spirit of loyalty, which had been displayed so conspicuously in their governors. One of them told the visitors, that he would submit to them when they had submitted to

\* By the death of Dr. Pinke.

† Dr. Stringer.



g. Another delivered a written answer in words: "In return to the citation of those who falsely call themselves visitors of this university, I answer, that I neither will, nor can, without injury to my king and conscience, submit to this visitation, nor own those for visitors, whom the king has so justly declared to be his enemies \*."

A. D.  
1648.  
Charles I.

Two years had already expired from the commencement of the visitation, before "the work of reformation" was perfected. Not above one fourth of the members on the foundations of the different colleges could be prevailed on to submit, and only two of their heads. Of these, Paul Hood, the rector of Lincoln, complied with all the changes of the times, and Gerard Langbaine, the learned provost of Queen's, was spared, at the intercession of Selden. Christ-church, which could number among its canons the illustrious names of Hammond, Sanderson, and Morley, was dispossessed of them all; Pococke remained, to undergo a persecution, at a subsequent, but not distant period.

To fill the places of such men was no easy task; and the visitors, by their conduct, seemed to consider it impossible. There was certainly a number of aspirants after those academical dignities, who possessed no other qualification than an insatiable appetite for their profits. The highest places were conferred on those presbyterian preachers who had prepared the way for the visitation, and who were now associated with the visitors. Cheynel, well known by the appellation of "the villanous antagonist of Chillingworth," was rewarded with the

\* Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

presidency of Saint John's College; Wilkinson, who is not sufficiently known to have any appellation at all, was placed at the head of the rich college of Magdalen.

The theological professorships were inadequately supplied; the one by Cross, a name too obscure to invite censure, and the other by Cheynel, who had now the pleasure of propagating his darling doctrine of predestination, without interruption and without danger.

Oxford was at length cleared of the loyalists and episcopalians. The visitors, having accomplished the ejectment of all who possessed those titles, ordered a serjeant with some files of musketeers to proclaim, by beat of drum, before the gate of every college, that, if any of those who had been expelled should presume to return, they should be taken into custody. But this order being found insufficient, a further order was proclaimed in the same manner, that if any one who had been expelled did presume to remain in the town, or to come within five miles of it, he should be deemed a spy, and punished with death\*.

Having thus described the entire revolution of the university, the attention must be directed to the situation of the king.

1647.

After the parliament, by its treaty with the Scots, had secured the royal person, and had nothing to fear from the arms of the royalists, it was resolved by the two houses to disband their victorious forces. But the army, apprehensive that a peace would be concluded on the basis of covenant uniformity, and

\* Wood's Antiq. Oxon.

without a toleration, determined to secure liberty of conscience before they were disbanded. For this end, they chose a council of officers, and a committee of agitators to manage their affairs. In the deliberations of those two bodies, an analogy to the two houses of parliament was preserved. The following resolutions were passed in this military council, and delivered by three delegates at the bar of the house of commons: "That they would not disband without their arrears, nor without full provision for liberty of conscience; that they did not look upon themselves as a band of janissaries, but as volunteers, who had been fighting for the liberties of the nation, of which they were a part, and that they were resolved to see those ends secured\*." These resolutions were communicated to the two houses; but they immediately passed an ordinance, that all the regiments which refused to enlist in the Irish service should be disbanded. The officers, instead of complying with this ordinance, bound themselves, and those under their command, by a solemn engagement, never to disband till all their grievances were redressed; and an order having passed the two houses for the seizure of Cromwell, who was then in London, he made his escape to the army.

A. D.  
1647.

Charles I.

The king's answer to the propositions delivered at Newcastle having been taken into consideration, and his desire to come near London, for the purpose of concluding a personal treaty, the lords voted that the palace at Oatlands should be prepared for his reception. At this crisis, the agi-

May 18.

\* Rushworth's Collect. vol. i.

**CHAP.  
XXVIII.**

tators supposed that whatever party had possession of the king could prescribe the terms of peace; and, under this impression, formed the bold resolution of seizing the king's person; a design which was executed with equal secrecy and expedition. Joyce, a cornet, with fifty of his troop, unresistingly took the king from Holdenby House, and brought him with triumph to the army at Newmarket.

The intelligence was received by the two houses with astonishment and indignation, mixed with terror; for it was expected that the army would advance immediately to London. An admonition to Fairfax not to advance within forty miles of the metropolis found him already at Saint Alban's; but he gave an assurance, that it was not his intention to oppose the presbyterian government, and a promise not to advance further. Still he insisted that those who could not conform to the presbyterian religion should be protected while they lived soberly and inoffensively towards others, and peaceably towards the state.

These assurances were disregarded by the commons; and they issued a declaration, that the king was a prisoner, and barbarously used; but the agitators replied, that the suggestion was false. They contended for a just freedom to all men, to the king and his adherents, as well as to others. It was impossible, they said, that any peace should be solid and permanent, unless there was a provision for the rights, the immunities, and the quiet of the king, his family, and all his followers. "We think," was their avowal, "that tender and equitable dealings, as supposing their cases had been ours, and

a spirit of common love and justice diffusing itself to the good and preservation of all, will make the most glorious conquest over their hearts, to make them, and the whole people of the land, lasting friends\*.”

A. D.  
1647.  
Charles I.

Liberty of conscience being the charter of the independents, and the professed object for which the army contended, they could not with consistency or decency refuse it to the king and the episcopal church. No restraint was imposed on access to the king; and he had no sooner expressed his wish that some of his chaplains might be sent for, than the request was cheerfully granted. Sheldon, Hammond, Sanderson, and Morley, were in attendance, and performed their functions with the accustomed formality. All persons, of whatever description, had liberty to be present at the divine offices of the royal household, and they were celebrated according to the ritual of the church of England†.

The presbyterians in the house of commons could not contain their anger within any reasonable bounds; and they advised that a new army should be raised, and that force should be opposed by force. Such was the suggestion of their impotent rage; but the agitators determined to drive them from the parliament, and thereby to liberate the kingdom from such intemperate and intolerant counsellors. The army impeached eleven members of the house of commons of high treason, accompanied by a desire that the persons accused might

\* Rushworth's Collection, vol. vi.

† Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, b. 10.

CHAP. be suspended from their legislative functions, till  
XXVIII. they were legally acquitted.

The commons having rejected the impeachment, and having commanded the king to be brought to Richmond, the army declared their purpose of marching to London; but the dispute was soon terminated in a manner the most unexpected. Terrified by the violence of the presbyterians of the city of London on the one hand, and by the menaces of the army on the other, the earl of Manchester, speaker of the house of lords, with eight peers, and the speaker of the house of commons, with a considerable number of members, withdrew privately, and joined the army. They were received with transport, and, under colour of protecting the liberty of parliament, the army marched to London, took possession of the Tower, and conducted the fugitive members in triumph to the house of parliament. Being reinstated in their seats, they voted all the proceedings which had taken place in their absence to be null; and their own conduct to be justifiable and legal.

August 14. The king was compelled to follow all the movements of the army; and when the city of London was possessed by a military force, he was removed to Hampton Court. There he resided during three months, in regal state and splendour, attended by the proper officers of the court, and by a vast resort of people, both from the city and the country\*. None were more obsequious in their attendance than the Scottish commissioners, who, after they

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, b. 10.

had delivered him to the English parliament, had repaired to London, to be included in the pending negotiation.

A. D.  
1647.

---

Charles I.

Whatever palliation may be offered for the vacillation and duplicity of the unfortunate Charles, while he continued with the army, yet he cannot be defended from want of judgment. It has been asserted, and the assertion has never been satisfactorily disproved, that the army was sincere in wishing to restore him on certain conditions. The conditions in his favour were, a freedom of conscience for himself in matters of religion, and a full toleration, though not a legal establishment, of episcopacy. But he had adopted the absurd notion, that he was to be the arbitrator between the parliament and the army, at a time when the parliament dared not to act, or even to speak, unless as the army dictated. When the proposals of the generals were offered, he said, "I shall see you glad ere long to accept more equal terms: you cannot be without me; you will fall to ruin, if I do not sustain you." Thus, while he deluded himself with the imagination that it was in his power to turn the scale, he saw, when too late, that all parties, except the defeated royalists, were determined to settle the government without him. While the army, whom he had never tried, submitted their proposals in the most respectful manner, he blindly engaged in a treaty with those who had already betrayed him, with the presbyterians of London, and the Scottish commissioners.

When his inclinations were discovered, the officers of the army changed their deportment and their language, and the soldiers plainly said, that

CHAP. God had hardened the king's heart, and blinded  
XXVIII. his eyes. Anonymous letters were daily received by him, advertising him of designs of assassination, till at length he took the infatuated and desperate step of escaping from the army. Whether he were the dupe of credulous simplicity, or the victim of deliberate treachery, it is hard to determine ; but  
Nov. 13. after leaving Hampton Court, to go he knew not whither, he was secured a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, without any stipulation for his honour, his liberty, or his life.

As soon as the parliament knew where the king was, a brief message was transmitted, soliciting his assent to four bills which had passed the two houses. By the first, he was to acknowledge himself the author of the late war ; by the second, he was to abolish the order of bishops, and to alienate all the church lands, reserving the settlement of the ecclesiastical government to a future consideration ; by the third, he was to resign the militia ; and by the last, to sacrifice all his adherents.

Together with the commissioners of the English parliament who brought the bills came the Scottish commissioners, who demanded an audience, and, with great formality and confidence, delivered a protestation against the bills being passed into a law. They objected against the bills, that they were prejudicial to religion, to the crown, and to the two kingdoms. That the king should have rejected these bills, without any suggestion, is not surprising ; but that, while he rejected them, he should have listened to some counter-propositions from the Scottish commissioners, which he had rejected while at Hampton Court, can be imputed



only to despair. It is needless to say, that the propositions were dictated by rigid presbyterianism ; but the conditions on which the king signed them were, that the Scots should raise an army to deliver him from his captivity, and to restore him to his throne with honour and freedom.

A. D.  
1647.  
Charles I.

When the English commissioners returned with the intelligence that the king refused his assent to the four bills, both houses concurred in a resolution, that no more addresses should be made, nor any messages received from him. The king was confined a close prisoner in Carisbrook Castle, attended only by two of his own servants, and debarred all communication, except with the knowledge of the governor of the island. He made several attempts to escape, but was prevented ; and his correspondence with the queen was generally intercepted.

1648.  
Jan. 17.

In pursuance of this treaty with the Scots, an army was raising in his favour in that kingdom, under the duke of Hamilton ; but the English royalists, impatient of delay, without any concert among themselves, or with the presbyterians, took up arms in several counties. These several risings were soon suppressed, and the whole strength of the royal cause resided in the Scots.

It was with great difficulty that the royalists in Scotland prevailed with the parliament of that kingdom to engage in the enterprise : the commissioners of the kirk, and the whole body of the clergy, opposed it ; and eighteen lords, with forty commoners, entered their protest against invading England. To prevent any private agreement with

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

the royalists and episcopalians, the Scottish parliament passed an ordinance, that none should be received into the army who refused to take the covenant, an ordinance which Hamilton found a method to evade.

July 11.

The Scots entered England, to the number of twenty thousand foot, and six thousand horse, and were joined by sir Marmaduke Langdale, and a body of English cavaliers. Such an invasion awakened the fears of all, though it could not lull their jealousies. Fairfax refused to fight against the presbyterians, and therefore Cromwell succeeded to the command of the army. After having gained

Aug. 17.

a decisive victory at Preston, he pursued his advantage by marching directly to Edinburgh, which opened its gates to receive him.

Before the army left London, and while the parliament was under military dictation, the commons voted unanimously, that the government of the kingdom should still be in the king, lords, and commons; and that the propositions delivered at Hampton Court should be the basis of the future settlement. But when the army had left the neighbourhood of the city, the presbyterians attempted to recover their predominance. The parliament began with passing a resolution to maintain the Solemn League and Covenant, and to unite with the kingdom of Scotland. The eleven members impeached by the army were restored to their seats, and all acts against the presbyterian interest were repealed. From the time of the king's coming to Hampton Court to the time of the Scottish invasion, the two houses were under military con-

trol; from that period to the conclusion of the treaty of Newport, they were under presbyterian influence.

A. D.  
1648.

Charles I.

It was during the absence of the army, that the treaty of Newport was suggested by the parliament, and cheerfully acceded to by the king. He desired the two houses to recall their vote of non-addresses, and to permit the access of his friends: he solicited the assistance of proper counsellors, and proposed that the Scots should be parties to the treaty. To these terms the lords agreed without any restriction; but the commons insisted, that no one who had been in arms against the parliament should interpose in the treaty, and that the Scots should not be comprehended in it. The commons further required, that, if the king were set at liberty, he should pass his royal word not to leave the Isle of Wight during the continuance of the treaty, nor until twenty-eight days after its conclusion, without the consent of parliament.

When the commissioners arrived in the island, they intimated to the king, that they could not permit any of his friends to be present while the articles of the treaty were in debate: they were commissioners sent to treat with the king, and with him alone. Thus, the divines and lawyers were permitted only to offer their advice, but not to interfere in the conference. When any difficulty occurred, the king was permitted to retire, and, having referred it to his advisers, he was to return, and openly declare his resolution. These were the unfair and unreasonable conditions to which he was compelled to submit, before the commencement of the treaty.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

Though the king was greatly changed in his person since his long and rigorous imprisonment, yet his cheerfulness had suffered no diminution, and his faculties no decay. "His hair was all gray, which making others very sad, made it thought that he had sorrow in his countenance, which appeared only by that shadow\*."

The divines selected by the king to assist him in the articles which concerned religion were of unshaken fidelity, of acknowledged learning, and of great moderation. Juxon, bishop of London, and Duppa, bishop of Salisbury, were the only bishops in attendance at the opening of the treaty; for it is painful to relate, that poverty prevented Prideaux, bishop of Worcester, from taking so long a journey, and imprisonment was the lot of Brownrigg, bishop of Exeter. Of the king's chaplains, Sanderson was the most able; his Prælections had been the study and the solace of the king during his confinement, and it is said, that the present English version of these excellent compositions ought to be numbered among the literary labours of Charles the First.

September. Four presbyterian ministers, Vines, Caryl, Scamman, and Marshal, were appointed by the parliament to assist their commissioners in the debates concerning religion.

It was previously settled that the treaty was to continue during forty days, on the basis of the propositions delivered to the king at Hampton Court. The business was opened by the parliamentary commissioners, who presented the king

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, b. 11.

with three bills : the first, to establish the presbyterian form of church government for ever in England ; the second, to give up the militia ; and the third, to recall all his declarations against the parliament. It is not within the design of this history to relate any other part of the treaty than that which concerned religion.

A. D.  
1648.  
Charles I.

After a long debate, the king with great reluctance agreed, that the assembly of divines at Westminster should be confirmed for three years ; that the Directory and presbyterian form of church government should be confirmed for the same period, provided that neither himself, nor any of his persuasion, were compelled to conform to them ; that a consultation should take place between the assembly of divines, and twenty divines of his own nomination, concerning the form of church government afterwards to be established ; that the church lands should be leased for ninety-nine years, or for three lives, provided the fee was still to remain in the church ; and that laws should be enacted for the better observance of the Lord's day, for suppressing innovations in churches and chapels, for regulating and reforming the universities, for the better discovery of papists, and for educating the children of papists in the protestant religion. But with respect to the Solemn League and Covenant, on which the commissioners were instructed peremptorily to insist, the king refused to subscribe it himself, or to suffer its imposition on others.

The commissioners, who would not suffer the king's divines to be present, "thought fit to let loose their own clergy on the king\*;" and against their

\* Clarendon.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

united attacks he singly maintained the same ground which he had taken in his conference with Alexander Henderson. Notwithstanding all the prejudices of the presbyterian ministers, their abhorrence of kingly dictatorship in religion, and their maxim that there is "no royal way" to theology, they could not but acknowledge the high intellectual attainments of Charles. There is no doubt of their sincerity, when they expressed their thanks for his condescension in permitting them to examine his learned reply, clothed in such excellence of style; and when they added their prayers, that a pen in the hands of such abilities might ever be employed on a subject worthy of them.

To detract from the talents of Charles, or to charge his pertinacious defence of the church of England on the interested advice of the episcopal clergy, it has been asserted by some historians, and it was asserted even by the presbyterian ministers, at the time of the treaty, that the conscience of the king was in the keeping of his divines. But when one of them\* took the freedom to observe, that the king's scruples were not so much his own as those of other men, Charles replied with warmth, that this was a mistake, or a misrepresentation, for his scruples were really his own†.

The treaty was prolonged from time to time, and, towards its conclusion, Usher was expressly summoned by the king. He obeyed, and submitted his project of moderate episcopacy, which, after having received the approbation of the king himself, was laid before the parliamentary commissioners. But the English and Scottish

\* Mr. Vines.

† Dr. Z. Grey's Remarks on Neal.

presbyterians were become too powerful to admit any proposition short of a full and exclusive establishment of their own discipline\*.

A. D.  
1648.

---

Charles I.

It has been stated†, that the majority of both houses, as well as the commissioners themselves, were at this time so far from wishing all their concessions to be granted, that, if they had been able to resist the despotic power of the army, they would have petitioned the king to be released from their strict observance. They privately assured him, that, if he would yield for a time, his conscientious scruples should be afterwards satisfied‡. The episcopal divines added their entreaties, that he would yield rather than hazard the loss of his crown, and perhaps of his life. But Charles was inflexible, because he was sincere; and in this negotiation, above all others, or as some would say, in this negotiation alone, his sincerity cannot be questioned. On one occasion, when the commissioners had used remonstrances and entreaties without effect; after they were retired, he said to his confidential attendant§, “I am like a captain that has defended a place well, and his superiors not being able to relieve him, he had leave to surrender it; but though they cannot relieve me in the time, yet let them relieve me when they can, else I will hold it out till I make some stone in this building my tombstone, and so will I do by the church of England.”

There cannot, at this time, remain the slightest doubt that, if the treaty of Newport had terminated

\* Parr's Life of Usher.

† Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, b. 11.

‡ Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iii. c. 10.

§ Sir Philip Warwick.

CHAP. XXVIII. favourably, the army would not have acceded to it. The army was composed chiefly of independents, and they hated, as they had reason to hate, the presbyterians more than the episcopalians, or the royalists. If presbyterian uniformity had been established on the basis of the Covenant, the condition of the independents would have been that of the most galling servitude. If the king himself could not be allowed to use the common prayer in his own household, what toleration could other sectarians expect ?

While the two houses were employed in debating whether the concessions of the king were a satisfactory ground of peace, the army returned from Scotland, flushed with military triumph, and under the influence of religious frenzy. The chief officers, who were high enthusiasts, determined to take the sovereign power into their own hands, to bring the king to punishment, to set aside the Covenant, and to change the constitution. A remonstrance was delivered to the parliament by Fairfax, before the conclusion of the treaty of Newport, desiring the house of commons to return to their former vote of non-addresses; to lay aside that bargaining proposition of compounding with delinquents, and rather to bring them to justice. Among those, the king was first to be brought to trial as the chief; the prince of Wales and duke of York were to surrender themselves, or to be declared incapable of government; and in future the king was to hold his office by the free election of the people.

Nov. 20. That the army carried these resolutions into effect against the sense of the two houses of parliament, and against the general voice of the na-

1649.



tion, it is needless to relate. The ecclesiastical historian is only concerned with the conduct of the episcopal clergy and laity, and with that of other sectaries. The episcopal clergy could not act in concert, for they were forbidden to assemble; but in their individual capacity, they made every possible exertion to save the life of the king. Gauden published a protestation against the declared purposes and proceedings of the army, which he caused to be presented to Fairfax at a council of war. Hammond sent an humble address to the general and council to prevent the horrid design.

A. D.  
1649.

Charles I.  
Jan. 5.

The officers of the army attempted to gain over the presbyterian ministers of London, or at least to secure their neutrality. Hugh Peters, the most influential of the military chaplains, was sent to the remnant of the assembly of divines; but that body declared unanimously for the release of the king. He then invited the principal presbyterian ministers to a conference with some officers of the army, on the subject of the coercive power of the magistrate in the matters of religion. But the presbyterian ministers, instead of complying with the invitation, assembled at Sion College, and published an address to the general and council of war, declaring their abhorrence of the projected murder of the king, as a flagrant breach of the Solemn League and Covenant. They disclaimed, detested, and abhorred the practices of Jesuits, in opposing lawful magistrates, and in murdering kings, "though under the most specious and colourable pretences."

Jan. 15.

Jan. 18.

The Scottish kirk, through their commissioners, declared and protested against putting the king

Jan. 25.

CHAP.  
XXVIII.

to death, as an act absolutely inconsistent with the Solemn League and Covenant. They published a protestation, directed to the ministers of London meeting at Sion College, exhorting that body to courage and constancy in opposing the violent measures of the house of commons.

It is impossible to pass over the conduct of the papists on this extraordinary occasion. From the injudicious favour with which they had been treated by Charles, from the fatal friendship which he had received from them, they might be expected to be sincerely devoted to his person and his government. But while proofs are wanted of any exertion of the Romanists, either at home or abroad, to prevent his destruction, they have been accused of encouraging, and even of contriving, the deed. A violent party writer\* has affirmed, that the death of Charles was planned and effected by papists and Jesuits, under the guise of independents; nay, that the king himself was informed of a resolution adopted by the Jesuits in France to bring him to justice, and to take away his life by means of their friends in the army. A far more unexceptionable evidence† has deposed to the same effect; that when the Romish Jesuits, and other religious, which

\* Prynne, *Foxes and Firebrands*, p. 2. Prynne adds, that Mr. Henry Spotswood saw the queen's confessor on horseback among the crowd, in the habit of a trooper, flourishing his sword over his head as others did, immediately after the king's decapitation, and said, "Now the greatest enemy we have in the world is dead!"

† Bishop Bramhall, in a letter to archbishop Usher, dated July 20, 1654. *Necess. Vindic.* p. 45. See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. c. 10.

were in disguise in the parliamentary army, wrote to their several convents, and especially to the Sorbonists, about the lawfulness of taking away the king's life, an answer was returned, that it was lawful for any catholic to work a change in an heretical government, for the advancement of the church, and therefore it was lawful to take away the life of the king.

A. D.  
1649.  
Charles I.

To relate the proceedings of the self-constituted court of justice, and the deportment of the king in the last scene of his life, would be to transcribe from histories which are in the hands of all. The presbyterian ministers, selected by the tribunal which condemned him, continued to offer their spiritual advice with the most cruel importunity, even while he awaited the signal for appearing on the scaffold; but his answer was, "They who have so often causelessly prayed against me, shall never pray with me; if they will pray for me in my last agony, I will thank them \*." Juxon possessed a constancy and fortitude, which enabled him to receive from the king his dying professions of attachment to the church of England; while Usher, who beheld the awful spectacle at a distance, sickened at the sight, and was borne away in a state of insensibility.

Jan. 30.

The general resentment of the nation was both deep and loud, and it was heightened by a work published in the king's name, within a few days after his execution. The *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, by its appearance at such a crisis, raised the character of

\* Echard's History of England.

CHAP. XXVIII. the king so highly, that many have ascribed to this book alone the subsequent restoration of his family. Milton has compared its effects, in exciting the compassion of the people towards the unfortunate Charles, to the feelings of the tumultuous Romans, when Anthony read to them the will of Cæsar.

At the time of its publication, Milton himself made a feeble attempt to impugn its genuineness : after the restoration, the claims of Charles to the authorship of this work were controverted with more success; and, in the present day, who wrote the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*? is one of those questions which may justly be considered as a touchstone of party.

The sum of the researches into this controverted question shall be briefly stated \*. Gauden, afterwards successively bishop of Exeter and Worcester, is the claimant who has been opposed to Charles for the authorship of this work. The external evidence is nicely balanced; so nicely, that an historian, friendly to the Stuarts†, has acknowledged, that it is not easy to fix any opinion which will be entirely satisfactory; and an eminent prelate, not favourable to the Stuarts‡, has, with the same frankness, confessed, that it is the most uncertain matter which he ever undertook to examine. On that external evidence, which two inquirers of great acuteness, and of an opposite bias, have left in suspense, the historian may decline to

\* It is superfluous to refer the reader to the work of Dr. Wordsworth.

† Hume's History of Great Britain, c. 59.

‡ Bishop Warburton's Remarks on Neal.

give a decisive opinion. As to the internal evidence, it preponderates greatly in favour of the king. If Gauden wrote the *Εἰκὼν Βασιλική*, he rose above himself. In whatever way the question may be determined, it will detract nothing from the literary reputation of Charles, or from the moral infamy of Gauden.

A. D.  
1649.

Charles I.

## CHAPTER XXIX.

State of the Church of England during the Usurpation, considered: 1. In its Internal History. 2. In its External History, as connected with the existing Government, and with the expatriated King.—Declaration of Charles at Breda.—His Return.—Restoration of the Monarchy and the Church of England.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

By the death of Charles, there was an entire dissolution of all that authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, by which the nation was accustomed to be governed. Every man had framed a system of religion peculiar to himself, and founded on his own fancied inspiration. A description of the various sects by which the kingdom was overspread belongs not to the historian of the church of England; his attention will be directed to its condition under the usurpation of Cromwell. The English church must be considered under two points of view, its internal and its external history.

I. Although her members were dispersed, and her revenues despoiled, the English church might apply to herself the apostolical characteristic of "rejoicing in persecution." The affection of her members for her primitive government and worship was strengthened, and their zeal in her defence was excited, in proportion as her external state was depressed and destitute. At no time was the divine institution of episcopacy so strongly asserted and unanswerably proved, as by Usher and Ham-

mond, when the English bishops were in peril of their lives, and when the name of prelacy was proscribed as antichristian and idolatrous. While episcopacy was the established form of government, Usher had asserted its rights with singular moderation, and his model of primitive episcopacy had received the approbation of many among the puritans. But when the church and the monarchy were prostrate, he was anxious lest it should be thought by foreign congregations, that the defence of the episcopal order had been universally abandoned. While Usher himself defended against Blondel the genuineness of the epistles of Ignatius, in which the rights of episcopacy are set very high, he encouraged Hammond to leave the narrow question of the genuineness of the Ignatian epistles, and to discuss the main and general argument of the divine origin of episcopacy.

A. D.  
1647.

That firmness of principle which gained strength from persecution, from the same cause was separated from all bitterness and intolerance. In the beginning of the civil wars, Jeremy Taylor, with the ardour of youth, had aided the cause of the church by his defence of episcopacy, and his apology for authorized forms of liturgy. When episcopacy was abolished, and all forms of liturgy prohibited, he pleaded for both in a different manner than formerly, but with greater effect, by his treatise "On the Liberty of Prophesying." Happily availing himself of a phrase which the fanatical teachers of the age had abused to the worst of purposes, to the encouragement of schism, and the subversion of order, he applied it to prove that, amid general latitudinarianism, a reasonable liberty ought to be

CHAP.  
XXIX.

granted to the persecuted church of England. Justifying himself from the charge of indifference to all religion, he recommended to the champions of the faith the use of no other weapons than those which suit the Christian warfare. To obtain a patient hearing for his argument, he gave a sketch of the opinions and practice of the Christian church, as to the question of toleration, and proved that persecution was a practice unheard of among Christians, till the church became worldly and corrupted. He also proved, that persecution in the western church was of a date comparatively recent with the introduction of Christianity. In England, more particularly, though the power of the popes was absolute, yet there were no executions for heresy till the reign of Henry the Fourth, who, having usurped the crown, endeavoured to conciliate the priesthood by these sanguinary sacrifices.

Of a work so rich in intellect, so renowned for charity, which contending sects have rivalled each other in approving, and which was the first, perhaps, since the earliest days of Christianity, to teach those among whom differences were inevitable, the art of differing harmlessly, it would be almost impertinent to enlarge in commendation\*. If the persecuted condition of the English church had produced no other effect than that of dictating Taylor's treatise "On the Liberty of Prophesying," she would not have suffered persecution in vain.

And while adversity taught the English church the great lesson of charity, even towards the most

\* Bishop Heber's *Life of Jeremy Taylor*.



pernicious heresies, it had an equally powerful effect in moderating the violence of such of her members as disagreed on points not fundamental, and on which her articles and formularies had not expressly decided.

A. D.  
1647.

---

Doctrinal Calvinism, which had been arrested in its progress by the Lambeth articles and the synod of Dort, had revived with the downfall of episcopacy, and the introduction of the presbyterian discipline. It had gained strength on two accounts: first, because its most successful opponents laboured under either unjust or well-founded suspicions of heterodoxy; and, secondly, because some of the most zealous defenders of episcopacy in the English church were equally attached to the doctrines of Calvin.

But presbyterian intolerance and persecution, intimately connected as they were with doctrinal Calvinism under the usurpation, moderated its attachment in some of the episcopalian divines, and induced an entire change in the opinions of others. A fact illustrative of this observation deserves to be recorded.

The fraternity of Sion College, being the remnant of the assembly of divines, issued a declaration, condemning a public and general toleration as unlawful and pernicious, and branded by the name of heresy the smallest deviation from the supralapsarian hypothesis. Among other errors which they denounced, they accused the excellent Hammond of maintaining tenets destructive of the fundamentals of Christianity, and repugnant to the Holy Scriptures. They particularly directed their censures against three passages in his Practical

**CHAP.  
XXIX.**

---

Catechism: the first, on universal redemption; the second, on faith being the condition of justification; and the third, on the interpretation of the third commandment. This attack called forth from Hammond a vindication of the truth of his opinions, and of their conformity with the doctrines of the church of England. It also occasioned a friendly conference between himself and two valued friends, Pierce and Sanderson, concerning God's grace and decrees; and the result of this conference was a change in the opinions of Sanderson \*, and an entire agreement between the three friends, in an aphorism always maintained by Hammond, "God can reconcile his own contradictions, and therefore advises all men, as the apostle does, to study mortification, and to be wise unto sobriety."

The sentiments of Usher, likewise, with respect to the Calvinistic points, experienced a change at the conclusion of his life, and he disclaimed those rigid notions of which he had once been the earnest advocate and propagator. He proceeded so far as to acknowledge the doctrine of universal redemption, without the Calvinistic distinction and reservation of the phrase, "the whole world," or "all mankind," to the world of the elect. In a sermon which he delivered at the close of his ministry, he forcibly inculcated the sincerity of God's universal call to every one of all sinners to whom the gospel

\* He was, it seems, inclined to acquiesce in the sublapsarian hypothesis till the last change of his opinions. As early as the year 1625, he says of himself, "I soon discerned the necessity of quitting the sublapsarian way, of which I had a better liking before; as well as the supralapsarian, which I could never fancy." See Dr. Hammond's *Pacific Disc.*, Works, vol. i.

was preached, adding, that unless this truth were admitted, all preaching to convert sinners from the evil of their ways would want a firm foundation. In a private conference, a learned divine took occasion from this sermon to ask, "Doth God, with his word, give internal grace to all who are called by it, that they may repent, if they will?" Usher replied, "Yes; they all can will; and that so many will not, is, because they resist God's grace." And he subjoined this acknowledgment: "Bishop Overal was in the right, and I am of his mind \*."

A. D.  
1648.

These were the matured opinions of three great luminaries of the English church; and such a triumvirate cannot easily be found. They were all humble but diligent inquirers after religious truth, and they sought it by a constant and careful study of the divine oracles. The fruit of these studies may be seen in their separate writings, and in a joint work, to the completion of which they mainly contributed, *THE POLYGLOT BIBLE*.

The principal and ostensible author of this undertaking was Brian Walton. This great divine received his early education in the university of Cambridge, and at the commencement of the civil war was one of the London clergy, and chaplain to the king. In the disputes between the clergy and citizens of London about tithes, he was conspicuously active, and rendered an essential service to his order, by a laborious collection of customs and prescriptions concerning the payment of ecclesiastical dues. As soon as the rebellion began, he

\* Life of Sanderson, by Izaak Walton.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

was summoned before the house of commons as a delinquent, was dispossessed of his living in the city, and, to secure his personal safety, was compelled to fly. In Oxford he found an asylum, and, under circumstances the most adverse, formed the noble design of the Polyglot Bible. The undertaking was sanctioned by the approbation of the English bishops, and more than approbation in their impoverished condition they had not to give\*. In the correction of the press, and the collation of the copies, he was assisted principally by Usher, Pococke, Sanderson, Hammond, and his father-in-law, Fuller. Four years were sufficient for the accomplishment of the most elaborate edition of the Scriptures which the Christian world had ever seen; and to judge of its merit, let this performance, by a few individuals of the depressed episcopal church, be compared with the boasted labours of the assembly of divines; their commentary on the Bible, and their catechism.

II. Having given a brief view of the internal history of the church during the usurpation, its external history must be subdivided under two heads: its connexion, first, with the existing government; and, secondly, with the expatriated king.

1. Immediately after the death of Charles, the constitution was declared to be a free common-

\* "Primo igitur inter alios eruditione ac judicio claros, Reverendiss. quorundam Eccles. procerum Dominorum et fautorum meorum in perpetuum colendorum, sententias humiliter rogavi, viz. Gulielmi, Episc. Londin.; Mathæi Eliens.; Briani Sarisburien.; Johan. Roffen.; Thomæ Lincoln., *τε μακαριτε*; et Radulphi Exon., virorum dignitate, doctrinâ, constantiâ, omnibusque virtutibus, conspicuorum, qui consilium meum calculis suis approbarunt." Walton. Pref.

wealth; the office of a king was voted to be unnecessary, burdensome, and dangerous to the liberty, safety, and public interest of the nation; and the house of peers was also voted to be dangerous and useless. The oaths of supremacy and allegiance were abolished, and a new test was framed, called **THE ENGAGEMENT**. It was simply an oath of fidelity to the government established, without a king or a house of peers; and such as refused the oath were declared incapable of any place or office of trust in the commonwealth.

A. D.  
1649.

When Cromwell was about to embark for Ireland, he sent letters to the parliament, recommending the removal of all penal laws relating to religion; and Fairfax, with his council of officers, presented a petition, or rather issued a command, to the same effect. They added, that it was not their wish to extend liberty of worship to the papists or the episcopalians, or to countenance any kind of immorality. The parliament submissively promised to take the petition into consideration, and its objects were fulfilled by the enactment of a law.

To include the presbyterian clergy under this new test, the Engagement, which had been originally framed for civil and military officers, was required to be taken by all ministers, and all members of the universities. No minister was capable of admission to any ecclesiastical benefice, no one was allowed to sit in the assembly of divines, unless he qualified himself within six months, by taking the Engagement publicly in the face of the congregation.

This was the first enterprise of the independents,

CHAP. and the new test was felt with the greatest severity  
XXIX. by the presbyterians and covenanters. To their scruples, that the Engagement could not be taken lawfully by any one who had taken the Covenant, it was replied, that to suppose either the oath of allegiance or the Covenant to have any force after the king's death was an absurdity. How could there exist any longer an obligation to protect the king's person, when the king was executed, and the kingly office abolished? The right of the hereditary successor of the late king had been forfeited and taken away by parliament; and with respect to the foundation of the existing government, it was not fit that private persons should dispute the rights and titles of their rulers.

Many of the presbyterian ministers chose to quit their preferments rather than to submit, and the Engagement dispossessed the presbyterians of their influence in the universities. In the university of Cambridge, several presbyterian governors of colleges were ejected; and in Oxford, Reynolds was deprived of his deanery at Christ-church. The progress of independent principles at Oxford was shown by the election of Cromwell to the chancellorship of the university.

The Engagement, though not so directly levelled at the episcopalians and royalists, aggravated their miseries; for many of the episcopal clergy, who, by favour or connivance, had been exempted from the Covenant, were ejected in consequence of a test which it was impossible to evade. Hales of Eton, after having declined to take the covenant, had been permitted to continue in his fellowship, but

was deprived on refusing to give the requisite pledge of fidelity to the commonwealth. A few of the episcopal clergy, among whom was Sander-son, submitted to the Engagement, as implying nothing more than a promise not to resist the existing settlement.

A. D.  
1653.

---

To reconcile the presbyterians to a republican government, founded on the basis of a general toleration of all religious sects, the parliament made several ordinances in their favour. But all concessions were insufficient to subdue their discontent; they joined themselves with the Scots, and by the assistance of their northern brethren, fondly expected to restore the Covenant in all its rigour, and to suppress popery, superstition, blasphemy, and all profaneness.

By the victory of Cromwell over the Scots, the presbyterian discipline, though not subverted, was restrained within reasonable bounds, and his elevation to the supreme dignity established the triumph of independency. The principle by which he professed to regulate his government was an impartial protection of all sects and opinions, on condition that their tenets were not inconsistent with the public safety: the policy which he actually practised was to blunt the animosity of the different religious sects with which the kingdom abounded, against himself, by sharpening it against each other. On his first elevation to the protectorate, his most dangerous enemies were the royalists and episcopalians; but as his government gradually tended towards a monarchy, his hostility against them relaxed, although he never succeeded in gaining their affection.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

But the presbyterians saw with mortification that the discipline and the Covenant, for which they had sacrificed so much, were to be overthrown by a force more irresistible than that of popery or prelacy. They regarded Cromwell not only as an usurper, but as a sectarian, who would tolerate the most pestilent heresies. Notwithstanding his assurances that the presbyterian discipline should be established, yet no establishment could be satisfactory, which comprehended a toleration of other sects.

In addition to the enmity of the episcopalians and presbyterians, Cromwell found another class of determined adversaries in the republicans, the chief of whom had no religion: they were professed deists, or, in the language of the protector, heathens. There was another kind of republicans, who, so far from being infidels, were high enthusiasts, and generally known by the name of fifth monarchy men. As these men expected the speedy reign of king Jesus upon the earth, they refused to acknowledge any other temporal or spiritual head; they aimed at the destruction of all churches, the abolition of tithes, and the removal of all religious establishments, as well as of all penal laws.

It was impossible for Cromwell to gain the cordial support of all these opposite parties; it was sufficient if he could render them innocuous. Such of his enemies as could not be won by flattery or promises, he deprived of the capability of doing mischief. The stern republicans, as Sidney and Harrington, he never attempted to conciliate; but with the violent enthusiasts he conversed in their own language, and the conversation generally ended



in a prayer. He assured them that he had no inclination to assume the government, but was contented with a shepherd's staff; and that he only stepped in between the living and the dead. When God vouchsafed to manifest a special interposition in the settlement of the nation, he would surrender his dignity with a joy equal to the sorrow with which he had assumed it.

A. D.  
1653.

---

That the settlement of the government might appear to be founded on the consent of the people, the protector summoned a parliament, and being seated in his chair of state, he delivered an address, complaining of the levellers and enthusiasts, whose notions of civil government were impracticable. He advised them to concert measures for the support of the constitution, and desired them to believe, that he spoke not as a lord and master, but as a fellow servant. But he was careful to intimate, that parliamentary power did not extend to the fundamentals of government, one of which was a due liberty of conscience in matters of religion.

The assembly of divines had terminated with the long parliament, which Cromwell dissolved by force, before he assumed the protectorate; but the presbyterian discipline, though not administered rigorously or steadily, was the established religion of the nation. When, therefore, the parliament of Cromwell directed its consideration to the religious state of the nation, it was a natural subject of inquiry and debate, how far presbyterianism should still retain a pre-eminence over other sects. By one of the articles framed by Cromwell, all who professed faith in God, by Jesus

CHAP.  
XXIX.

Christ, were protected in the exercise of their religion. This profession was interpreted into an agreement in the fundamental points of religion ; but to define and determine what these fundamental points were, was left to a committee of divines, nominated by the parliament. Twenty articles were framed by this committee, excluding not only deists, Socinians, and papists, but the new sect of quakers, Arians, and antinomians.

Such a limitation of the fundamental points of Christianity, and such a restriction of toleration, kindled the indignation of Cromwell. He abruptly dissolved his first parliament, and gave the following severe reprehension : " How proper is it to labour for liberty, that men should not be trampled on for their consciences ! Have we not laboured under the weight of persecution, and is it fit to sit heavy on others ? Is it ingenuous to ask liberty, and not to give it ? What greater hypocrisy, than for those who were oppressed by the bishops to become the greatest oppressors themselves ? I could wish that they who call for liberty now, also had not too much of that spirit, if the power were in their hands."

After the abolition of episcopacy, the power of ordination, and the approbation of public ministers, had been first confided to the assembly of divines, and, after the dissolution of that body, had been exercised by local presbyteries. Cromwell was unwilling to intrust such a formidable power to the presbyterians alone, who would admit none but those of their own persuasion ; and he devised a plan of joining the leading men of the several sects in a commission. He carried his design into exe-

cution by an ordinance of council, and a commission, consisting of thirty-eight members, was appointed, of whom some were presbyterians, others independents, and two or three were baptists. The chief part of the commissioners were ministers, but there were eight or nine laymen. Any five were sufficient to approve; but no number under nine had power to reject a candidate.

A. D.  
1654.

As the office of these commissioners was to try the qualifications of candidates for the ministry, they are most commonly known in ecclesiastical history under the appellation of TRIERS. A court composed of such discordant elements has been the object of censure and praise equally extravagant. Presbyterian praise has been profusely lavished on its impartiality and its useful labours\*; but by the independents, as well as the episcopalians, it has been compared to the Inquisition. Its powers were said to be hyperarchiepiscopal, and suprametropolitan†. In the time of prelacy, the law had provided against an arbitrary rejection of the presentee to a benefice, and although the bishop was authorized to judge of the qualifications of a candidate, yet these qualifications were distinctly laid down in the canons; but the determination of the triers was absolute and final, and the ordinance specified no other qualification than that of a holy conversation, joined with the indefinable requisites of grace, knowledge, and utterance.

Not only was the sentence of the triers absolute

\* Baxter's Life and Times, p. 72.

† Goodwin's Triers Tried, p. 25. It was in their judgment even worse than the Inquisition. Q. Quis Diabolus? A. 'O ΠΕΙΡΑΖΩΝ.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

and final, but their authority was retrospective. No person who had been placed in a benefice for nearly a year preceding the date of the ordinance was allowed to continue in it, unless his appointment was confirmed by the triers. In case of any dispute or suit concerning the right of patronage, the commissioners were expressly authorized to sequester the profits during the continuance of the suit, and to provide for the service of the cure.

Whatever might have been the intention of Cromwell in instituting this commission, it was principally turned against the royalists and episcopalians, whom neither the Covenant nor the Engagement had forced from their benefices. They had no favourers or friends among the commissioners, and, in the opinion of these judges, had neither grace, knowledge, nor utterance. To read the Common Prayer was a sufficient evidence of the want of all these qualities, and was an equal reason for ejection with the grossest immorality.

The commission of triers was not the only act of tyranny exercised against the episcopalians under the protectorate of Cromwell. A subsequent ordinance was passed, "for ejecting scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient ministers and schoolmasters." But the measure of the sufferings of the episcopal clergy was filled up, by a declaration of the protector and his council, of the most unparalleled cruelty. The ejected clergy sometimes found a refuge and an employment in private families, either as chaplains or instructors of youth; but Cromwell deprived them of the legal enjoyment of this privilege. The extremities to which this last declaration reduced the episcopal

1654.  
Aug. 28.

1655.  
Nov. 24.

clergy, compelled some of them to try the effect of personal application and remonstrance. Gauden A. D.  
1655. had the courage to present a petition to the protector for a repeal, or a relaxation, of this oppressive act. Usher, who enjoyed the friendship of the protector, remonstrated, in a private interview, on the injustice of this ordinance; but all the mitigation of its severity which he could obtain was a promise that its execution should be suspended, as far as the peaceable deportment of the clergy might deserve an indulgence. The primate, at all convenient opportunities, renewed his mediation, but was at last obliged to "retreat to his country retirement, and thence to his grave," without success\*.

After the declaration, persecution appeared to have exhausted itself, and it is therefore natural in this place to inquire, what was the number of the episcopal clergy ejected, under the successive domination of the presbyterians and independents? That the number was great, appears from the variety of the methods adopted to dispossess them, as well as from the long continuance of the persecution.

The authorities on which the greatest reliance can be placed are the contemporary testimonies of the enemies of the church, who could have no motive either to exaggerate or to lessen the number of the sequestered clergy. White, the centurist, is said to have boasted in the house of commons, that he and his committee had ejected their thousands. This assertion of White is confirmed by the account of the sufferers themselves, and an eminent

\* His failure in this point was said to have hastened his death.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

---

divine has not hesitated to say, that a larger number were ejected from their benefices in the space of three years by the presbyterians, than had been deprived by the papists in the reign of queen Mary, or than had been silenced, suspended, and deprived by all the bishops from the beginning of queen Elizabeth's reign to the commencement of the civil wars\*. Gauden, in the petitionary remonstrance which he delivered to Cromwell, stated the number at eight thousand, and Gauden would not have ventured, in a public address to such a man as Cromwell, to make a false or a careless statement.

It has been already mentioned, that the fifth part of the revenues of the benefice was reserved, by an ordinance of the long parliament, for the maintenance of the ejected incumbent; and this regulation was renewed under the protectorate of Cromwell. But the ordinance was more frequently an aggravation than a relief of the hardships suffered by the episcopal clergy. Various were the contrivances and evasions by which the intruders withheld from the rightful possessors the scanty subsistence assigned by the existing government. The ordinance of Cromwell provided, that a fifth of the clear produce of the living should be paid, after a deduction of all parochial charges, public taxes, and other dues; and even when the intentions of the possessor of the benefice towards the sequestered incumbent were honest, these deductions rendered the living of small value. Not only were the deductions large and certain, but the payments were irregular and small. Many of the high

1654.  
August.

\* Heylin's History of Presbytery, p. 450.

enthusiasts deemed tithes as antichristian, and a relic of Judaism, and either refused to pay them at all, or paid only as much as they thought fit.

A. D.  
1655.

Such was the condition of the parochial clergy of the persecuted church of England. Her prelates were in a state not more prosperous; and many of those, whom a presbyterian parliament had consigned to want and misery, a protector, whose professions were liberty of conscience and universal toleration, suffered to languish and die in indigence. Usher, whom Cromwell affected to treat with confidence, and whom he could not but regard with sincere veneration, was permitted to hold the honourable station of preacher at Lincoln's Inn; but with his incapacity of fulfilling its duties, his means of subsistence terminated. Private friendship alone\* preserved him from the sting of penury; while the promises of the protector, unfulfilled† during his life, ended in procuring for him the unavailing honour of a pompous funeral‡. Hall, whose moderation in the season of prosperity had disarmed the rancour of the most inveterate enemies of episcopacy§, and whose fortitude in affliction was

\* Of the countess of Peterborough.

† A lease of the church lands of the see of Armagh was promised, but never executed; and it is doubtful whether the pension promised was ever paid. Parr's Life of Usher.

‡ The protector defrayed but half the expenses of the funeral; the other half fell very heavily on Usher's relations. Ibid.

§ "Let my clergy witness, whether they were not entertained with an equal return of reverence, as if they had been bishops with me, or I a presbyter with them; according to the old rule of Egbert, archbishop of York: *Infra domum, episcopus collegam se presbyterorum esse cognoscat.*"—Bishop Hall's Letter from the Tower.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

1656.  
ob.

1650.  
ob.

equally conspicuous with his former moderation, whose "only crime was his calling," was for a long time deprived even of his temporal estate. Prideaux, whose moderation and charity resembled those qualities in Hall, could leave no other legacy to his numerous family than pious poverty, God's blessing, and a father's prayers.

This was the state of the episcopal clergy during the government of Cromwell, when their inoffensive deportment ought to have procured for them a higher degree of favour. Still more dangerous was the condition of those, whose attachment to the royal family was ardent and active. They had already felt the oppressive weight of presbyterian intolerance for their religion, and they now felt the excruciating gripe of independent tyranny for their loyalty. The remaining part of the external history of the church must be devoted to its connexion with the expatriated king.

2. The divines, whom persecution forced to fly from their country with the royal family, or who submitted to a voluntary exile, were few in number, but eminent for learning and station. Steward, formerly dean of St. Paul's, was the ostensible adviser of the king in ecclesiastical matters, and appears to have retained till his death the confidence and affection of his sovereign. Cosins, the late dean of Peterborough, and master of Peterhouse, in the university of Cambridge, was the first of the episcopal clergy who was sequestered, and one of the first who was compelled to fly. The place of his exile was Paris, where he kept up the English discipline and worship in the king's household. He reclaimed some of the English who had been



seduced to popery, and confirmed others in the protestant faith. He had several conferences and disputations with the Jesuits and Romish priests, in which he acquitted himself with so much ability, that he exceeded even the expectation of his friends. Morley, after having attended the gallant lord Capel to the place of execution, quitted England, and resided first at the Hague, and afterwards at Breda, where, during his exile, he read the liturgy of the church of England, catechised the youth, and administered the sacraments. He was so firmly fixed in his principles, that he was impregnable either against the solicitation of a splendid papacy, or the ignominious treatment of the ruder disciplinarian party. He had courage enough to own a persecuted church and an exiled prince\*.

A. D.  
1650.

---

The difficulties of the episcopalian divines, who followed the king into exile, were sufficient to shake an ordinary degree of constancy: they had to contend with the inclinations of the king himself. From the time of his succession to the empty title of king of England, the queen mother endeavoured to retain that influence over her son, which she had so fatally exercised over the father. To gain him to the church of Rome was the object of her unwearied solicitude; for this she employed art and intimidation, promises and threats; and if she did not entirely succeed in converting him to popery, she infused into his mind a disregard and contempt of all religion.

From complete thralldom to the tyranny and bigotry of his mother, Charles was rescued by the

\* Wood's Athen. Oxon.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

---

vigilance of sir Edward Hyde, afterwards earl of Clarendon. He was the prop of the fallen fortunes of the house of Stuart, and of the persecuted episcopal and protestant church of England. He connected the restoration of Charles with the restoration of the church; for he knew that neither presbyterianism nor popery was a secure basis for the re-establishment of royalty. His anxiety, during the exile of his sovereign, was directed first to the preservation of the doctrine and discipline of the church among his exiled countrymen; and secondly, to secure the episcopal protestant succession among those who remained in England. If the English bishops had all died without any new consecration, the succession would have been broken, and recourse must have been had either to the church of Rome, or the validity of presbyterian ordination must have been admitted. The English episcopacy had been invalidated by the church of Rome, by invalidating the consecration of archbishop Parker, and the calumny which had slumbered, while the church was established, revived when episcopacy was abolished by law. In a treatise published by the Romanists "on the nature of the catholic faith and of heresy," the fact of archbishop Parker's consecration at a tavern was confidently re-asserted, and was attempted to be supported by a gross falsehood. An appeal was unblushingly made to Moreton, the aged and sequestered bishop of Durham; and this prelate was accused of having made a declaration in the house of lords, that the protestant bishops, in the beginning of queen Elizabeth's reign, had been consecrated in a tavern. It was added, that the other bishops present in the house

of lords agreed in the truth of Moreton's representation, and that the fact was notorious to the whole world. Moreton, now in the ninety-fourth year of his age, being informed of this calumny, sent for a public notary from London, and in the presence of competent witnesses, made a solemn protestation of the falsehood of the story, and signed his protestation in due form. He then sent his chaplain, the celebrated Barwick, to all the lords spiritual and temporal, at this time living, who were members of the long parliament, earnestly desiring that, if they believed him to be undeservedly aspersed, they would attest their belief by subscribing a declaration. The protestation of Moreton was confirmed by six bishops and fourteen temporal lords, and by the clerks and registrars of the house. The bishop of Durham died shortly after this transaction; but his protestation and the other documents were collected and published by Bramhall, bishop of Derry\*.

This calumny of the Romanists awakened the English clergy, and they were convinced of the necessity of continuing the succession of a protestant episcopacy, lest they might be reduced to the alternative of obtaining a new conveyance of the episcopal authority from the church of Rome, or of admitting the validity of presbyterian ordination. Sir Edward Hyde interceded with the king to nominate fit successors to the vacant sees; but though the king willingly acceded, yet it was

\* In a treatise entitled "The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops justified; the Bishop of Durham vindicated; and the Fable of the Ordination of the Nag's Head Club clearly confuted."

---

**CHAP.  
XXIX.**

extremely difficult to provide men of character, who would expose themselves to the danger of accepting the episcopal office; and it was not less difficult to persuade the deprived bishops to engage in the perilous task of consecrating such as might be prevailed on to obey the king's commands. These were formidable impediments, and another still remained, the difficulty of procuring a canonical election of a diocesan bishop, since there were no longer any deans and chapters to be the electors.

Several expedients were proposed to obviate this last difficulty. Sir Edward Hyde thought that the consecration should take place by virtue of a mandate from the king, directed to any three or four bishops, collating a successor to the vacant see, in consequence of a lapse occurring by the non-election of the dean and chapter. But it was objected, that to suppose a lapse would be to weaken the royal prerogative; because such a supposition implies that the chapter has a plenary power of election; whereas its power is derived from the king. Bramhall, bishop of Derry, was in favour of the mode of election practised in Ireland, where the king has an absolute power of nomination, and collates to a vacant see by his letters patent. In the present emergence, he thought it preferable that the nominees of the king should be consecrated in Ireland, and then be removed to English sees. But as the plan of sir Edward Hyde was thought to be derogatory from the regal prerogative, so that of Bramhall appeared to be subversive of the capitular rights. Wren, bishop of Ely, to whom the matter was referred, far from wishing that

the mode of election adopted in Ireland should be introduced into this kingdom, declared, that if ever Providence permitted him to see the restoration of the church, he would be a suitor to the king for the introduction of capitular election in Ireland.

A. D.  
1659.

A third project was suggested by a divine, who has been already noticed incidentally as the chaplain of bishop Moreton, but whose originality of character demands, that he should not be considered as the satellite even of prelacy and royalty. To great dexterity in business, and an intimate knowledge of mankind, Barwick united sanctity of manners, and singleness of heart\*. His proposal was, that the king should grant a com-

\* This celebrated divine was an active and steady adherent of Charles I. and II. He was born at Wetherslack, in Westmoreland, where he distinguished himself by acting the part of Hercules in one of Seneca's tragedies. In his eighteenth year he was sent to St. John's College, Cambridge, where his abilities and attainments were so conspicuous, that, when he was little more than twenty, he was chosen by the members of his college to be their advocate in the controverted election of a master, which was heard before the privy council. He had the chief hand in the *Querela Cantabrigiensis*, and it was principally owing to his influence that the Cambridge plate was presented to the king. He managed with great address the correspondence between Charles I. and the city of London, while the king was at Oxford. He was so dexterous in his correspondence with Charles the Second, that he eluded the vigilance even of Thurloe. He is said to have furnished Clarendon with a great part of the materials for his history; and the noble historian ought to have remembered his obligations to Barwick, before he penned the following severe sentence: "That the clergy take the worst judgment of human affairs of any set of men who can read and write." See Granger's *Biog. Hist.*, vol. iii. Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*. Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* and *Life of Barwick* by his brother.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

mission to the bishops of each province, assembled in council, empowering them to elect and consecrate fit persons to fill the vacant sees, the king having first signified his recommendation of the persons to be elected. The commission ought to be antecedent to the election, and the king's ratification of the whole process might be granted on the certificate or petition of the bishops.

The expedient of Barwick, after due consideration, was adopted, and he received instructions from sir Edward Hyde to draw such a commission as might be proper, and to finish it with all possible expedition. With regard to the king, it may be supposed, that his concern for the succession of protestant bishops was simulated; but with regard to his advisers it was sincere. But the transaction was delayed by an event the most unexpected—by the recall of the exiled family, and the RESTORATION OF THE CHURCH AND MONARCHY.

To enter into a detail of the political causes which produced this event, and which led to the declaration of Breda, is beyond the province of the ecclesiastical historian; but the declaration itself will afford matter of comment.

The distractions and confusion which pervaded the kingdom were assigned by the king as a sufficient reason for his interposition: it was the only way to restore tranquillity. A pardon was proclaimed to all his subjects, of whatever degree and quality, provided they would return to their allegiance, with the exception of such persons as should be excepted by the parliament. On that great question of religion which was mingled with all the civil animosities which had so long dis-

tracted the nation, the declaration was explicit. A liberty was allowed to all tender consciences, and a promise was given, that no man should be disquieted in future for such differences of opinion as were not prejudicial to the peace of the kingdom. An assurance was also made, that the king would give his assent to such an act of parliament as might be offered to him for the grant and security of that toleration and indulgence.

A. D.  
1660.

---

Looking impartially at this declaration, it will appear that toleration and liberty of conscience were promised, but nothing more. There was no comprehension of all sects within the pale of the church, no enlargement of the terms of communion either promised or intended. The measure of toleration was to be regulated by the wisdom of parliament.

That more was not promised, is evident from the discontent with which the declaration was received by the great body of the presbyterians. The Scots sent over the earls of Lauderdale and Crawford to Holland, with an humble representation that the kirk of Scotland expected his protection of the presbyterian establishment, without a toleration of sectaries. Their brethren in the north of Ireland joined in an address to the same purport, and some of the English presbyterians were of this opinion. The aim of the presbyterians was the settlement of the ecclesiastical government on the basis of the treaty of Newport; but when they perceived that the current of public opinion was in favour of episcopacy, they aimed to reduce it to the model of archbishop Usher, which at that treaty they had rejected.

When the declaration of Breda was read in the

CHAP.  
XXIX.

house of commons, it was voted that, according to the ancient constitution of England, the government was, and ought to be, in a king, lords, and commons; and a committee was appointed to frame a dutiful address, inviting the king to return to his dominions. Sir Matthew Hale moved, that a committee be appointed to review the propositions of the treaty of Newport, and he was seconded in the motion. But Monk, who was prepared for such an overture, objected that he could not answer for the peace of the kingdom, if any delay took place in sending for the king. "What need is there of it," he inquired, "when he is to bring neither arms nor treasure with him?" This representation seemed an immediate compliance; money was voted to defray the king's expenses, and a fleet was ordered to convey him home. He was to return free and unfettered by any treaty\*.

When the two houses sent a deputation with their address, the presbyterian ministers of London requested and obtained a licence for some of their body to wait on the king. Six of their number were delegated† for that purpose, and at an audience they magnified the affections of themselves and their friends. They thanked God for his majesty's continuance in the protestant religion, and professed that they were no enemies to moderate episopacy; only they desired that such things might not be pressed upon them in God's worship, as in the judgment of those who used

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv.

† Reynolds, Speerstown, Calamy, Hall, Manton, and Case.—  
Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv.



them were indifferent, and in their judgment were unlawful\*.

A. D.  
1660.

---

The king answered them with great kindness, assuring them that he had no intention of imposing hard conditions upon them with reference to their consciences: he had referred the settlement of all differences to the wisdom of his parliament, which best knew what indulgence and toleration was necessary for the peace and quiet of the kingdom.

But this could not satisfy the presbyterians; they asked several private audiences, which the king never refused. At one of these they told him, that the book of common prayer had been long discontinued in England, and the people having been disused to it, and many of them having never heard of it in their lives, it would be wondered if his majesty should, at his first landing in the kingdom, revive the use of it in his chapel, whither all persons would resort: therefore they besought him, that he would not use it entirely and formally, but have only some parts of it read, with a mixture of other good prayers which his chaplains might use.

The king told them, with some warmth, that while he gave them liberty, he would not have his own taken from him; that he had always used that form of service which he thought the best in the world, and had never discontinued it in places where it was more disliked than he hoped it was by them; that, when he came into England, he would not severely inquire how it was used in other churches, though he doubted not he should find it used in many; but he was sure he would have no

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, b. 16.

CHAP.  
XXIX.

other used in his own chapel. Then they besought him with more importunity, that the use of the surplice might be discontinued by his chaplains, because the sight of it gave great offence and scandal to the people. They found the king inexorable on this point, as well as the other: he told them plainly, that he would not be restrained himself when he gave others so much liberty; that the surplice had always been held a decent habit in the church, constantly used in England till the late times; that it had been still retained by him; and though he was bound for the present to tolerate much disorder and indecency in the exercise of God's worship, he would never, in the least degree, by his own practice, discountenance the good old order of the church in which he had been bred. Though the answers of the king were unsatisfactory, yet these divines ceased to remonstrate, in a hope that they might find their importunity and opposition more effectual in England\*.

The bishops had long maintained a private correspondence with the king, through the lord chancellor; and they were not less forward than the presbyterians in a personal application. Barwick was sent to Breda with instructions to return the thanks of the prelates to the king, the chancellor, the lord lieutenant of Ireland, and to the secretary of state, for their piety and affection to the church in its afflicted state. He was farther instructed to give the king an exact account of the existing state of the church, and to assign a reason why the affair of filling the vacant sees had

\* Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, b. 16.

not been prosecuted with greater diligence. Barwick was received with that distinction to which his eminent services entitled him, and, on the Sunday after his arrival at Breda, was appointed to preach before the king\*.

A. D.  
1660.

---

To appease the jealousy of the different dissenting sects, lest any retaliation should be made by the church at its restoration, Barwick and Morley were commanded by the chancellor to interpose. They were required to intercede with the bishops of Ely and Salisbury, that these prelates would use their authority in allaying such fears and apprehensions. "Truly," observed the chancellor, "I hope, if faults are not committed, that both the church and kingdom will be better dealt with than is imagined; and I am confident, these good men will be more troubled that the church should undergo a new suffering by their indiscretion, than for all that they have suffered hitherto themselves†."

Under these propitious circumstances, the king landed at Dover, and hastened on the same night to Canterbury. The next day, being Sunday, he remained in that city, and went to his devotions at the cathedral and metropolitan church. The noble edifice was greatly dilapidated; but the people seemed glad to hear the common prayer again. Two days after, he entered London, with his brothers, amid the acclamations of the people. As he passed, an aged presbyterian minister presented to him a bible richly embossed‡, which was received with expressions of gratitude, accompanied

\* Life of Barwick.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv. c. 4.

‡ Arthur Jackson. Baxter's Life, p. 248.

**CHAP.**  
**XXIX.**

with a declaration that he would make the divine word the rule of his conduct.

On his arrival at Whitehall, the use of the liturgy was restored in the royal chapel; and by this act it was publicly announced, that episcopacy was again, as of old, the legal establishment, and the common prayer the legal service, of THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

APR 18 1916

END OF VOLUME II.


LONDON:

PRINTED BY THOMAS DAVISON, WHITEFRIARS.















UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 06297 2727

**BOUND**

SEP 30 1931

UNIV. OF MICH.  
LIBRARY



0894

